

**Case**

## **Solvency Core**

## 1NC Solvency Frontline

**Status quo solves hard and fast – 1.8 billion dollars in funding, recent summit doubled reserves, the US isn't key, and Obama doesn't need Congress for anything – this post-dates all relevant solvency evidence**

**Hogan 6-19** [Ben, Environmental News Network, ARKive.org, June 19, 2014, "Over \$1 Billion Pledged to Project Marine Habitats," <http://blog.arkive.org/2014/06/in-the-news-1-8-billion-pledged-to-protect-marine-habitats/>] WD

**Over \$1.8 billion has been pledged** by various parties **at the 'Our Ocean' 2014 summit**, and proposals have been made to double the amount of protected marine habitats around the world. 'Our Ocean' 2014 brought together leaders from business, government and academic institutions, and NGOs from over 80 countries to discuss how economic development and ocean conservation can be reconciled. The oceans are extremely important for humans, generating more than 50 percent of the oxygen we breathe, absorbing excess carbon dioxide, and providing a source of food and income for millions of people worldwide. **The summit concentrated on several key themes in ocean conservation including sustainable fishing, marine pollution, and ocean acidification.** Perhaps **one of the most significant announcements** at Our Ocean **was President Obama's intention to expand and create new marine reserves** in the Pacific Ocean, **while Kiribati announced it will expand its already vast Phoenix Islands Protected Area.** If implemented, **these proposals will more than double the total area of legally protected oceans.** President **Obama said** in a video to participants at Our Ocean, **"I'm going to use my authority to protect some of our nation's most precious marine landscapes."** Many of the world's fish stocks are being fished at unsustainable levels, and it is thought that around 30 percent of the world's fisheries are overexploited. **The Our Ocean summit aimed to examine the steps fishery management authorities need to take to reduce, and ultimately end, overfishing and to mitigate adverse impacts on the broader marine environment.** **Initiatives** proposed at the summit **aim to end all overfishing on marine fish stocks by 2020**, through a series of measures including **increased transparency in allocating fishing rights, tougher enforcement of legislation and penalties for illegal fisheries, elimination of excess capacity in fishing fleets and minimising bycatch.** To this end, **President Obama has announced a comprehensive new national programme on seafood traceability and openness** which will allow customers in the United States **to ensure that their seafood has been harvested legally and sustainably.** Additionally, the United States launched the 'mFish' partnership, which will provide mobile devices to small-scale fisheries in developing nations with apps designed to access market and weather information and ensure accurate and easy catch reporting. **Norway also pledged more than \$150 million to promote fishery management and development** abroad, **including a new research vessel to train fisheries experts and managers around the world. Significant advances have been made in addressing marine pollution from land- and ocean-based sources**, by individuals and local communities **at the regional and global scale**, although much more needs to be done. **Our Ocean 2014 has facilitated the development of initiatives to reduce total nutrient pollution in the ocean by 20 percent and to significantly reduce the input of debris into the marine environment by 2025.** To help achieve this, **Norway will allocate up to \$1 million for a study on measures to combat marine plastic waste and microplastics.** Additionally, **the United States announced the Trash Free Waters programme, which aims to stop waste and debris from entering the ocean through sustainable product design, increased material recovery and recycling, and a new nationwide waste prevention ethic.** Due to ocean acidification, our oceans are approximately 30 percent more acidic than before the industrial revolution, and the ocean's chemistry is currently changing 10 times faster than at any other time in the past 50 million years. Many organisms will not be able to adapt to the changes within their habitat, which will negatively impact both biodiversity and the crucial services that the

oceans provide us. Initiatives to prevent further increases in ocean acidification were developed at the Our Oceans summit, which aim to reduce carbon emissions and monitor ocean acidification on a global scale. Norway announced that it will allocate over \$1 billion to climate change mitigation and adaptation assistance in 2015. The United States presented new projects to meet the challenges of ocean acidification and marine pollution in Africa, Central America, and the Caribbean, as well as contributing \$640,000 to support the Ocean Acidification International Coordination Center in Monaco.

### **Enforcement isn't key – Obama executive authority solves the aff and will check against future issues**

**PIN 6-22** [Private Island News, News Network, June 22, 2014, "USA: Obama Promises to Double the World's Marine Reserves," <http://www.privateislandnews.com/2014-jun-22-usa-obama-promises-to-double-the-worlds-marine-reserves/>] WD

US President Barack Obama has promised to create the world's largest marine protected area (MPA) in the centre of the Pacific Ocean – with or without the help of the Republicans. US President Obama has this week announced his intent to create the world's largest Marine Protected Area (MPA) which – if successful – will see the surface area of the world's marine reserves double in size whilst simultaneously putting an end to illegal fishing practices within the much-maligned region. As reported on Tuesday within The Washington Post, the protected area will stretch over huge swathes of the central Pacific region, expanding an existing protected zone – the Pacific Remote Island Marine National Monument – from 225,000 km<sup>2</sup> to an incredible 2 million km<sup>2</sup> and taking in eleven islands and atolls along the way. Announcing the decision at the State Department's Our Ocean conference, President Obama spoke at length not only about his plans to use his executive authority in order to expand the existing marine protected but also about new strategies aimed to better police the area around the Pacific Remote Islands for signs of illegal fishing activities. The President's environmental advisor, John Podesta, told journalists at The Washington Post that the marine conservation initiative is planned to come into force towards the end of year, following the completion of a public consultation period which is currently scheduled for the summer of 2014. The well-timed decision – announced just weeks after the United Nations Environment Program declared the world's oceans, islands and low lying states to be a matter of utmost importance – forms a major statement of intent for a government which has so far done very little to address ocean-related environmental concerns. The decision to create this new MPA has been warmly received by environmentalists the world over. Emily Woglom, vice president for conservation and policy at the Ocean Conservancy, said in a statement that Obama's announcement "shows that the President is turning his attention to his Blue Legacy," whereas Beth Lowell of the Oceana conservation group declared the move to be a "historic step".

### **Even if they're right about enforcement, it's functionally impossible – it's a question of available technology, not funding**

**USIA 6/18-** USIA, 2014 ("Obama's Ocean: Will An Executive Order Save the Ailing Sea?," June 18th, Available online at <https://usia.com/2014/06/obamas-ocean-will-an-executive-order-save-the-ailing-sea/>, Accessed 6-26-14)

782,000 miles of open ocean. That's a lot of space to patrol. One might say it's impossible to effectively enforce the new restrictions over such a vast area of the remote sea. Given the range of modern aquatic radar and the influx of satellite imagery, one would assume enforcement shouldn't be too difficult. However, we have to take into account

the case of MH370. With all of our modern technology, we can't even find a jumbo jet that has been equipped with devices specially designed to be found. If we can't find a wrecked plane that wants to be found, how are we going to locate poachers who don't?

Evidence points to the fact that **there aren't enough resources to patrol or protect the existing boundaries of the sanctuary**. It is not uncommon for foreign vessels to be illegally fishing in the protected zone when that craft can catch a half a million dollars' worth of tuna in a few days. They will disregard the US laws. **Satellite imagery and radar works in theory, but these technologies have been in use there for over two decades and does little to stop illegal maritime activity**. Even if a radar or satellite does pick up a fishing vessel several hundred miles away, it would be days before a patrol ship intercepts it. Even with **the fastest, highest range helicopters can only fly about 350 nautical miles before needing to refuel. Most places would be out of range** unless we want these aircraft to drop from the sky en route.

## **Turn – marine reserves makes fish less intelligent – they're easier to catch and are less weary of people**

**Ecology Global Network, 12** [11/13/12, "Easy Catch Out of the Reserve", Ecology Global Network, <http://www.ecology.com/2012/11/13/marine-reserves-make-fish-naive/>, accessed 6/28/14, HG]

**Big fish that have grown up in marine reserves do not seem to know enough to avoid fishers** armed with spear guns waiting outside the reserve. The latest research by an Australian team working in the Philippines into the effects of marine reserves has found **there is an unexpected windfall awaiting fishers who obey the rules and respect reserve boundaries – in the form of big, innocent fish wandering out of the reserve**. "There are plenty of reports of fish, both adults and juveniles, moving out of reserves and into the surrounding sea. **Having grown up in an area where they were protected from hunting, we wondered how naïve they would be with regard to avoiding danger from humans**," says Fraser Januchowski-Hartley of the ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies at James Cook University. The answer is: pretty naïve. "Educated fish normally turn tail and flee when a diver armed with a spear gun approaches within firing range of them. The typical flight distance is usually just over four metres," he explains. "However in our studies of marine reserves in the Philippines, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea, where spearfishing remains a major way of harvesting table fish, we discovered that **reserve-reared fish were much less wary and allowed people to get much closer. "The fish are literally more catchable."** The team studied fish across the boundaries of marine reserves from 200 metres inside the protected areas to 200 metres into the fished areas. They used underwater markers and measuring tapes to measure the 'flight initiation distance' of fish targeted locally by spear fishers. This indicates how close a skin diver can approach to a large fish before it decides to turn and flee. They found that **target fish living in fished areas were typically much warier of divers, and took flight at distances a metre or two further away, than ones living within the reserve**. They also established that the 'naivete radius', whereby more catchable fishes spill out of the marine reserves extended for at least 150 metres from the boundary. The team's findings suggest that fishers are more likely to catch fish that stray out of the reserve, and so improve the local fish harvest. This may help fishers become more supportive of marine reserves. JCU's Dr Nick Graham, a co-author on the study said that in these parts of the oceans, spear fishing was still very much about survival for humans and putting food on the family table. "So it is important that local fishers feel they are deriving some benefit from having a local area that is closed to fishing, or they may not respect it," Dr Graham said. "This information is also useful in traditional reserves where fishing is taboo most of the time, but then they are opened for fishing by village elders just a few days a year." Mr Januchowski-Hartley said that on the face of it, this work suggests that marine reserves can play an important role in putting more fish on the table of local communities in these tropical locations – as well as conserving overall fish stocks and replenishing those outside the reserve.

## They can't solve – the environment is terminally dead due to inevitable coral reef destruction

ROGER BRADBURY, 7/13/12 (an ecologist, does research in resource management at Australian National University, "A World Without Coral Reefs", New York Times, [http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/14/opinion/a-world-without-coral-reefs.html?pagewanted=all&\\_r=0//AKP](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/07/14/opinion/a-world-without-coral-reefs.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0//AKP))

IT'S past time to tell the truth about the state of the world's coral reefs, the nurseries of tropical coastal fish stocks. They have become zombie ecosystems, neither dead nor truly alive in any functional sense, and on a trajectory to collapse within a human generation. There will be remnants here and there, but the global coral reef ecosystem — with its storehouse of biodiversity and fisheries supporting millions of the world's poor — will cease to be. Overfishing, ocean acidification and pollution are pushing coral reefs into oblivion. Each of those forces alone is fully capable of causing the global collapse of coral reefs; together, they assure it. The scientific evidence for this is compelling and unequivocal, but there seems to be a collective reluctance to accept the logical conclusion — that there is no hope of saving the global coral reef ecosystem. What we hear instead is an airbrushed view of the crisis — a view endorsed by coral reef scientists, amplified by environmentalists and accepted by governments. Coral reefs, like rain forests, are a symbol of biodiversity. And, like rain forests, they are portrayed as existentially threatened — but salvageable. The message is: "There is yet hope." Indeed, this view is echoed in the "consensus statement" of the just-concluded International Coral Reef Symposium, which called "on all governments to ensure the future of coral reefs." It was signed by more than 2,000 scientists, officials and conservationists. This is less a conspiracy than a sort of institutional inertia. Governments don't want to be blamed for disasters on their watch, conservationists apparently value hope over truth, and scientists often don't see the reefs for the corals. But by persisting in the false belief that coral reefs have a future, we grossly misallocate the funds needed to cope with the fallout from their collapse. Money isn't spent to study what to do after the reefs are gone — on what sort of ecosystems will replace coral reefs and what opportunities there will be to nudge these into providing people with food and other useful ecosystem products and services. Nor is money spent to preserve some of the genetic resources of coral reefs by transferring them into systems that are not coral reefs. And money isn't spent to make the economic structural adjustment that communities and industries that depend on coral reefs urgently need. We have focused too much on the state of the reefs rather than the rate of the processes killing them. Overfishing, ocean acidification and pollution have two features in common. First, they are accelerating. They are growing broadly in line with global economic growth, so they can double in size every couple of decades. Second, they have extreme inertia — there is no real prospect of changing their trajectories in less than 20 to 50 years. In short, these forces are unstoppable and irreversible. And it is these two features — acceleration and inertia — that have blindsided us. Overfishing can bring down reefs because fish are one of the key functional groups that hold reefs together. Detailed forensic studies of the global fish catch by Daniel Pauly's lab at the University of British Columbia confirm that global fishing pressure is still accelerating even as the global fish catch is declining. Overfishing is already damaging reefs worldwide, and it is set to double and double again over the next few decades. Ocean acidification can also bring down reefs because it affects the corals themselves. Corals can make their calcareous skeletons only within a special range of temperature and acidity of the surrounding seawater. But the oceans are acidifying as they absorb increasing amounts of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere. Research led by Ove Hoegh-Guldberg of the University of Queensland shows that corals will be pushed outside their temperature-acidity envelope in the next 20 to 30 years, absent effective international action on emissions. We have less of a handle on pollution. We do know that nutrients, particularly nitrogenous ones, are increasing not only in coastal waters but also in the open ocean. This change is accelerating. And we know that coral reefs just can't survive in nutrient-rich waters. These conditions only encourage the microbes and jellyfish that will replace coral reefs in coastal waters. We can say, though, with somewhat less certainty than for overfishing or ocean acidification that unstoppable pollution will force reefs beyond their survival envelope by midcentury. This is not a story that gives me any pleasure to tell. But it needs to be told urgently and widely because it will be a disaster for the hundreds of millions of people in poor, tropical countries like Indonesia and the Philippines who depend on coral reefs for

food. **It will also threaten the tourism industry of rich countries with coral reefs, like the United States, Australia and Japan. Countries like Mexico and Thailand will have both their food security and tourism industries badly damaged.** And, almost an afterthought, **it will be a tragedy for global conservation as hot spots of biodiversity are destroyed.** What we will be left with is an algal-dominated hard ocean bottom, as the remains of the limestone reefs slowly break up, with lots of microbial life soaking up the sun's energy by photosynthesis, few fish but lots of jellyfish grazing on the microbes. It will be slimy and look a lot like the ecosystems of the Precambrian era, which ended more than 500 million years ago and well before fish evolved. **Coral reefs will be the first, but certainly not the last, major ecosystem to succumb to the Anthropocene** — the new geological epoch now emerging. That is why we need an enormous reallocation of research, government and environmental effort to understand what has happened so we can respond the next time we face a disaster of this magnitude. It will be no bad thing to learn how to do such ecological engineering now.

## **2NC Enforcement Not Key**

**Obama solves both regulatory and enforcement concerns and the US isn't key – all the aff does is anger fishing lobbies**

**Rock 6-24** [Rock of the Coast, June 24, 2014, "Obama Proposes Bold Expansion of Pacific Ocean Marine Sanctuaries," <http://www.rockofthecoast.com/2014/06/24/obama-proposes-bold-expansion-of-pacific-ocean-marine-sanctuaries/>] WD

Launching a broad campaign to address significant maritime issues such as overfishing and pollution, on June 17 President Obama announced that, by executive order, he intends to make a vast stretch of the Pacific Ocean the world's largest marine sanctuary—off limits to fishing, energy exploration and other activities. The administration also plans to create a mechanism to allow the public to nominate new marine sanctuaries off U.S. coasts. The proposal, which will take effect later this year, calls for the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument to expand from about 87,000 square miles to almost 782,000 square miles. The designated ocean area encompasses a remote, uninhabited region adjacent to islands and atolls controlled by the U.S. and extends up to 200 nautical miles offshore from these territories. The proposal faces the objection of the U.S. tuna fleet that operates in the region. Up to 3% of the annual U.S. tuna catch is caught in the western and central Pacific. When the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument was created by President George W. Bush in 2009, sport fishing was exempted to counter industry opposition. If the protected area expands, recreational fishing interests will probably seek to retain the existing exemption to avoid setting a precedent, even though sport fishing activity in the expanse is scarce. A public comment period this summer will provide the Departments of Commerce and Interior with up-to-date information on the level of commercial activity in the area and make any necessary modifications. The potential expanded area would include a five-fold increase in the number of protected underwater mountains, halt tuna fishing, and shelter dozens of species of marine mammals, endangered sea turtles, as well as a variety of sharks and other predatory species, and protect some of the world's most pristine and biologically rich marine ecosystems. As part of the administration's increased focus on maritime issues, the President will also direct federal agencies to develop a comprehensive program to fight seafood fraud and the worldwide black-market fish trade, and review of steps the U.S. can take to stop illegal fishing, which does untold damage to marine ecosystems and to coastal nations around the world. Obama has also been advised to consider expanding the borders of the monuments Bush created in the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands and the Marianas Trench. Other countries are also creating marine reserves. The British government is moving to protect the area around the Pitcairn Islands in the Pacific, and the small Pacific island of Kiribati plans to close an area roughly the size of California to commercial fishing by year's end. "The President's proposed action is a huge step forward for the ocean," said Frances Beinecke, President of the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC). "Expanding these protections will provide a safe haven for coral gardens, seamounts, and the rich waters that support hundreds of species of fish, sea turtles, giant clams, dolphins, whales and sharks, conserving them for future generations. This represents a commitment to the kind of bold action needed to restore the failing health of our ocean, on which we all depend, and continues the bipartisan tradition of ocean protection. We hope it sets the stage for taking similar action to protect key areas of our ocean around the U.S. and the world."



## **2NC Impossible to Enforce**

### **Enforcement fails-- too strict and its more likely to be violated**

Braxton C. Davis, Gred S. Moretti, 7/2007 "Enforcing U.S Marine Protected Areas, Synthesis Report", National Oceans and Aeronautics association, National Marine Protected Areas Center, ( University of Southern California, Baruch Institute for marine and coastal sciences, Greg is as IM systems contractor for NOAA and the Marine Protective Area Center  
<http://marineprotectedareas.noaa.gov/pdf/publications/enforcement.pdf//AKP>

A number of authors have described the need for regulations to be developed in a manner that facilitates enforcement (Sutinen, Rieser, and Gauvin 1990; Laurec 1999; Nielsen and Mathiesen 2000). According to these studies, regulations should be as compatible with existing fishing patterns and practices as possible. In several Danish fisheries, nearly all fishers reported that practical difficulties limited their ability to comply with regulations (Nielsen and Mathiesen 2000). In addition, the more restrictive a regulation, the greater the incentive is to violate (Sutinen, Rieser, and Gauvin 1990). It therefore appears important that managers anticipate the immediate economic impacts of new marine protected area regulations (Ortiz 2001). Next, regulations should be internally consistent, as well as consistent with the policies of other relevant agencies (Dermer 2001). Mascia (2003) found that clear, easily understood, and easily enforceable regulations were positively correlated with MPA performance. Regulations should also remain stable over time in order to maintain awareness (Sutinen, Rieser, and Gauvin 1990); however, a tradeoff exists between stability and the flexibility needed for adaptive ecosystem management (Hanna 1998). Finally, Nielsen and Mathiesen argue that regulations should be perceived as credible, and therefore must either be demonstrated to achieve results through periodic program evaluations or must be based on the experiences and knowledge of the fishers themselves (Nielsen and Mathiesen 2000). Kuperan and Sutinen (1998) suggested that it may also be critical that fishers perceive the boundaries of closed areas as reasonable and appropriate. Further, it may be important to avoid specific predetermined targets for the aerial coverage of future MPAs during MPA planning, such as "fifty percent of the area should be set aside for biodiversity preservation" (Agardy and others 2003; Davis and Lopez 2004). Several authors noted that it is equally important that management goals be stable, credible, compatible with existing practices, and consistent both internally and with other regulations. Evidence suggests that perceptions of MPA management goals can vary significantly between stakeholder groups (Suman, Shrivani, and Milon 1999; Brody 1996), and that these differences may influence perceptions of the legitimacy of management institutions.

### **Obama's plan doesn't solve – region is uninhabited and doesn't need protection**

**Goldenberg 14** (Suzanne, US environment correspondent, "Obama to expand marine reserves and crack down on seafood black market," The Guardian, June 17, 2014,  
<http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2014/jun/17/obama-oceans-marine-reserves-leonardo-dicaprio>, accessed 6/26/14)

But the move was in some ways symbolic. Because the islands are uninhabited, there is very little fishing in the area Obama proposes to protect, and no indication mining or drilling is imminent. However, scientists say bigger marine sanctuaries are easier to enforce and allow more species to recover. More than 350 scientists this week signed on to a letter to the White House urging Obama to expand marine sanctuaries to up to 20% of each ocean region under US control.

## **One-size-fits-all strategy fails for reserves – turns the case**

**Norse et al.,** Founder and Chief Scientist of Marine Conservation Biology Institute, **3**

[Elliott A., Ecological Society of America, *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* Vo. 1 No. 9 p495-502, “Marine Reserves: The Best Option for Our Oceans?” November 2003, <http://palumbi.stanford.edu/manuscripts/marine%20reserves%20the%20best%20option%20for%20our%20oceans.pdf>, ML]

Most MPA literature begins with a litany of the failures of fisheries management and MPA advocates have often used the fisheries management benefits of MPAs as a major selling point. MPAs can only benefit the yield of managed species if the species is overfished and if the movement rate of the spawning population is low enough relative to the size of the MPAs that spawning populations can build up inside them. Shipp (2002) points out that these two circumstances are rather unusual. Only 30% of the major fisheries in the US are classified as overfished, and for most of those species the movement of adults is great enough that only large MPAs would have much effect. Since current yield of US fisheries is over 80% of its potential yield (Hilbor et al. in press), there is little room for MPAs to increase fish yields. For MPAs to be effective in increasing sustainable yield for a species, the sizes of the protected areas must be carefully matched to the movement of that species. If the MPAs are very large relative to movement, then yield is reduced because the fish are locked up. If the MPAs are too small, then there is insignificant buildup inside the reserves. No pattern of MPAs will be optimal, or even suitable, for all species; having different areas closed for different species would provide better yield and conservation benefits than blanket MPAs. Such areas are steps forward in the management of fisheries because they recognize the need for spatial management, but they are very blunt tools and we can do much better than one-size-fits-all networks if our objective is to maximize sustainable yield. Rather than broadly improving fisheries yields, a network of MPAs might improve yield in a few instances. MPAs must be integrated into the fisheries management system. It is easily demonstrated that adding an MPA to a fishery regulated by catch quotas will generally require that the quota be reduced. While advocates argue that MPAs will increase fish yields (PISCO 2002), they rarely, if ever, do the quantitative work necessary to determine how regulations will need to change when an MPA is put in place

## **Multiple challenges to solvency – misplacement, ignoring non protected areas, and alt causes**

**Norse et al.,** Founder and Chief Scientist of Marine Conservation Biology Institute, **3**

[Elliott A., Ecological Society of America, *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* Vo. 1 No. 9 p495-502, “Marine Reserves: The Best Option for Our Oceans?” November 2003, <http://palumbi.stanford.edu/manuscripts/marine%20reserves%20the%20best%20option%20for%20our%20oceans.pdf>, ML]

Marine conservation lags behind terrestrial conservation in funding, science, and implementation. The sluggishness with which we have come to focus on marine conservation is inexcusable. However, there is some advantage to not being first. In particular, we can learn from the successes and failures associated with longstanding systems of parks and wildlife preserves on land. As we race to establish MPAs, we should pause to consider the following ten lessons that are gleaned from our experience with terrestrial conservation. \* Terrestrial parks have often been located in the wrong places - typically those

that are of little economic value (Scott et al. 2001). For example, in the US we have many national parks in areas of snow and rock, with little productivity or biodiversity. If we take a similar approach to marine conservation, and place MPAs where political forces offer the least resistance, we will end up with an ill-designed reserve network. \* Many supposedly protected terrestrial areas are in fact no more than "paper parks", in which a lack of enforcement results in poaching, illegal logging, and even mining. Enforcement will probably be an even greater challenge in the marine realm. \* Global climate change is real and represents a serious challenge to the design of any reserve network. Parks that are fixed in space therefore risk becoming obsolete. Clearly, consideration of resilience in the face of climate change should be a part of any plan for MPAs (West and Salm 2003). \* Invasive species are the greatest threat to terrestrial reserves, but have not figured prominently in discussions of marine conservation. However, invasive species often dramatically alter marine ecosystems (Simberloff 2000). Marine reserves will require as much protection against non-indigenous species as against harvest or other human disturbances. \* All too often, terrestrial conservation has focused on collecting long lists of species, with little attention paid to the maintenance of critical ecological processes. In terrestrial systems these processes include natural disturbances such as fires and floods. In marine systems they could include freshwater inputs and recolonization following large disturbances such as hurricanes. Whereas a relatively small area may capture many species within its borders, it usually takes a much larger area to protect ecological processes. \* On a related note, a myopic focus on the accumulation of long lists of species within the smallest possible area (biodiversity hotspots) can fail to protect the diversity of ecosystems and ecosystem services (Christensen 2003; Kareiva and Marvier 2003). A focus on species protection will typically lead to a very different allocation of conservation effort than would a focus on the conservation of ecosystem diversity. Both species protection and ecosystem protection should be considered in plans for marine conservation. \* Corridors and connections between terrestrial reserves are widely embraced in theory, but poorly documented with data (Simberloff et al. 1992). The same mismatch between theoretical appeal and empirical support is evident in marine discussions of "connectivity". Before rushing to invest in marine corridors, we should await some convincing evidence of their effectiveness. \* The ecological status of the matrix in which terrestrial reserves are embedded can be as important as the integrity of the parks themselves (Daily 1999). It may be impossible to achieve our conservation goals if we focus too narrowly on marine reserves to the neglect of the surrounding human-dominated landscapes and seascapes. \* Wide-ranging species such as caribou, salmon, and migratory birds have posed special challenges to conservation planners in terrestrial settings (Groves 2003). These same challenges will apply to the many wide-ranging marine species, and will require a much more complicated strategy than just networks of biodiversity reserves. \* No nature reserve system can be sustainable without also making sure that local human populations are provided for (UNCED 1992). This principle will certainly hold for coastal fisheries, which many local communities rely on for livelihood and food. Much is made of the unique challenges posed by marine conservation. While marine systems have extraordinary biological nuances, many of the lessons learned from terrestrial conservation will surely apply equally well in a marine setting. The critical difference between marine and terrestrial conservation has less to do with biology than with the policy context and political justifications used when arguing that marine areas should be set aside as reserves. Specifically, advocates of MPAs commonly argue that the spillover of fish from within these areas can supplement harvest in surrounding zones, and hence provide a win-win conservation tool (protected biodiversity and greater harvest). Meanwhile, on land, no one asks that terrestrial protected areas produce a surplus of wildlife that spills over and supports surrounding hunting communities. Perhaps we should think

about MPAs in the same way we think about terrestrial parks - simply as secure havens for biodiversity. The real challenge for marine conservation may well lie in the management of non- reserve areas, which we risk neglecting in our fondness for MPAs.

## **Reserves fail – alt causes**

**Allison et al**, Department of Zoology, **98**

[Gary W., Ecological Society of America, p879-892, “Marine Reserves are Necessary but Not Sufficient For Marine Conservation, <http://research.pbsci.ucsc.edu/eeb/rclab/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/Allison-et-al.-Ecol-App-1998.pdf>, ML]

The intensity of human pressure on marine systems has led to a push for stronger marine conservation efforts. Recently, marine reserves have become one highly advocated form of marine conservation, and the number of newly designated reserves has increased dramatically. Reserves will be essential for conservation efforts because they can provide unique protection for critical areas, they can provide a spatial escape for intensely exploited species, and they can potentially act as buffers against some management mis-calculations and unforeseen or unusual conditions. Reserve design and effectiveness can be dramatically improved by better use of existing scientific understanding. Reserves are insufficient protection alone, however, because they are not isolated from all critical impacts. Communities residing within marine reserves are strongly influenced by the highly variable conditions of the water masses that continuously flow through them. To a much greater degree than in terrestrial systems, the scales of fundamental processes, such as population replenishment, are often much larger than reserves can encompass. Further, they offer no protection from some important threats, such as contamination by chemicals. Therefore, without adequate protection of species and ecosystems outside reserves, effectiveness of reserves will be severely compromised. We outline conditions under which reserves are likely to be effective, provide some guidelines for increasing their conservation potential, and suggest some research priorities to fill critical information gaps. We strongly support vastly increasing the number and size of marine reserves; at the same time, strong conservation efforts outside reserves must complement this effort. To date, most reserve design and site selection have involved little scientific justification. They must begin to do so to increase the likelihood of attaining conservation objectives.

## **Either fish are too confined or too much free movement – turns the case**

**Palumbi**, Department of Organismic and Evolutionary Biology at Harvard University, **3**

[Stephen R., Ecological Society of America, p146-158, “POPULATION GENETICS, DEMOGRAPHIC CONNECTIVITY, AND THE

DESIGN OF MARINE RESERVES,

<http://web.stanford.edu/group/Palumbi/manuscripts/Palumbi2003ECOLAPPL13.1.pdf>, ML]

Empirical studies of reserve export have been limited to a few cases in which (1) fish tagged within reserves have been captured outside (Attwood and Bennett 1994), (2) fisheries yields have increased outside of the reserve boundaries (McClanahan and Kaunda-Arara 1996), and (3) larvae of protected species are more abundant just outside a reserve than far outside (see Palumbi 2001 for review). Because

these empirical studies have been so difficult to conduct, modeling efforts have played a strong role in developing an understanding of how marine reserves function in a regional context (see Botsford et al. 2003). Yet these models generally rely on several assumptions about the degree of demographic exchange between the reserves in a network or between reserves and the exploited habitats surrounding them (Palumbi 2001). Low dispersal between a reserve and the surrounding habitats can severely limit the ability of a reserve to enhance productivity in the overall fishery, because extra eggs, larvae, or adults are "trapped" inside the protected area. On the other extreme, infinite movement of adults from reserves to surrounding, unprotected zones severely reduces reserve effectiveness, especially when reserves are small and adults are very migratory. In such cases, individuals are protected only as long as they are inside reserve boundaries, and reserves as a management tool function only as well as traditional control of fishing effort (Hastings and Botsford 1999)

## 2NC Intelligence Turn

**Marine reserves destroy survival instincts of fish which makes them susceptible to further fishing**

**Mangalorean, 12** [11/19/14, "Reserves Dumb Down Fishes' Survival Instincts", Mangalorean, <http://www.mangalorean.com/specials/specialnews.php?newsid=359577&newstype=local>, accessed 6/28/14, HG]

Sydney, Nov 19 (IANS) Marine reserves seem to dumb down survival instincts among protected fishes, especially when it comes to avoiding spear fishers outside the protected zone, according to an Australian study. Researchers from ARC Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies at James Cook University said big, innocent fishes wandering out of the reserve present an unexpected windfall to spear fishers awaiting them. "There are plenty of reports of fish, both adults and juveniles, moving out of reserves and into the surrounding sea. Having grown up in an area where they were protected from hunting, we wondered how naive they would be with regard to avoiding danger from humans," says Fraser Januchowski-Hartley of the ARC centre. The answer is: pretty naive. "Educated fish normally turn tail and flee when a diver armed with a spear gun approaches within firing range of them. The typical flight distance is usually just over four metres," the journal Ecology Letters reports. "However, in our studies of marine reserves in the Philippines, Vanuatu and Papua New Guinea, where spearfishing remains a major way of harvesting table fish, we discovered that reserve-reared fish... are literally more catchable," it said. The team studied fish across the boundaries of marine reserves from 200 metres inside the protected areas to 200 metres into the fished areas, according to an ARC statement. They used underwater markers and measuring tapes to measure the 'flight initiation distance' of fish targeted locally by spear fishers. This indicates how close a skin diver can approach to a large fish before it decides to turn and flee. They found that target fish living in fished areas were typically much warier of divers, and took flight at distances a metre or two farther away, than ones living within the reserve. They also established that the 'naivete radius', whereby more catchable fishes spill out of the marine reserves extended for at least 150 metres from the boundary.

## **2NC Not Enough**

### **Authors concede that marine reserves aren't enough--major solvency deficit**

Barry W. **Brook et al**, Navjot S Sodhi, Corey J.A. Bradshaw, 2008 (Research Institute for Climate Change and Sustainability, School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Adelaide, Adelaide, SA 5005, Australia, Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, 14 Science Drive 4, Singapore 117543, Republic of Singapore, South Australian Research and Development Institute, P.O. Box 120, Henley Beach, SA 5022, Australia, School for Environmental Research, Charles Darwin University, Darwin, NT 0909, Australia "Synergies among extinction drivers under global change" Trends in Ecology and Evolution, 6/24/08, 6/24/14, <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S016953470800195X//AKP>)

This review shows that extinction research has shifted substantially over the last decade, from studies that focussed primarily on the impact of single drivers to those which have demonstrated a positive interaction (synergies, or reinforcing feedbacks) of more than one threat via a combination of approaches. This view explicitly emphasises how positive feedbacks corrode ecosystem function and energy flow 10, 11 and 39. The implication of this recent body of work is that only by treating extinction as a synergistic process will predictions of risk for most species approximate reality, and conservation efforts therefore be effective 6, 9, 45, 52 and 57. However challenging it is, policy to mitigate biodiversity loss must accept the need to manage multiple threatening processes simultaneously over longer terms. Habitat preservation, restoring degraded landscapes, maintaining or creating connectivity, avoiding overharvest, reducing fire risk and cutting carbon emissions have to be planned in unison. Otherwise, conservation actions which only tackle individual threats risk becoming half-measures which end in failure, due to uncontrolled cascading effects.

### **Reserves can't solve – alt causes to biodiversity loss and illegal activity**

**Tupper et al**, University of Guam Marine Laboratory, 2

[Mark H., Marine Pollution Bulletin, "The three screen doors: Can marine "protected" areas be effective?", <http://smma.org.lc/Public/Publications/Jameson%20et%20al%202002%20MPB.pdf>, ML]

The great majority of marine protected areas (MPAs) fail to meet their management objectives. So MPAs can be effective conservation tools, we recommend two paradigm shifts, the first related to how they are located and the second related to how they are managed. MPAs are unlikely to be effective if they are located in areas that are subject to numerous, and often uncontrollable, external stressors from atmospheric, terrestrial, and oceanic sources, all of which can degrade the environment and compromise protection. MPA effectiveness is also limited by low institutional and community capacity for management and inappropriate size with respect to ecological needs. In particular, the check list approach to management does not ensure that key threats are dealt with, or that management expenditures provide a quantifiable return. We recommend a business planning approach to MPA management, in which managers focus on the viability of the management system, i.e. the ability of the MPA to provide ecological goods and services to its target users over the long term. © Elsevier Science Ltd. All rights reserved. Keywords: marine protected area, management effectiveness, community capacity, institutional capacity, business planning, index of biotic integrity. The general who wins a battle makes many calculations in his temple before the battle is fought. It is by attention to this point that I can foresee who is likely to win or lose. Sun Tzu, The Art of War, 500 B. C. 1. The 3 screen doors: a

management perspective The lack of effectiveness in marine protected areas (MPAs) is no mystery to MPA managers in the field and is highlighted by several authors (Kelleher et al. 1995; Alder 1996; McClanahan 1999). Of the 1,306 MPAs surveyed world-wide by Kelleher et al. (1995) only 31% of the areas thought they were achieving their management objectives. Several efforts are now underway to determine if MPA management is effective (Hockings et al. 2000; Ehler et al. 2002; MBRS 2002, CSC 2002). In this exercise of "thinking outside the box", we contend that the critical question that needs prompt consideration, and much more rigorous evaluation (both for existing and future MPAs), is not if MPAs are effective but can MPAs be effective. American naval personnel have long described tools or methods that did not work with the old saw "as useless as a screen door in a submarine". Unless MPA managers have control over stressors entering from atmospheric, terrestrial and oceanic sources, they are trying to manage the proverbial "submarine with 3 screen doors". They might have some success on the terrestrial side (Causey 2002), but the atmospheric and oceanic sides are usually international, as well as large-scale national problems, and not easily mitigated. To illustrate the point we only have to look at the premier coral reef MPA in the United States — the Florida Keys National Marine Sanctuary (FKNMS). From 1996 to 1999: • coral cover has decreased 38%; Page 2 S.C. Jameson et al. / Marine Pollution Bulletin 44 (2002) 1177-1183 1178 • the average rate of coral loss is 13% per year and is unsustainable; • the number of monitoring stations where disease occurred increased, as has the number of coral species affected; and • there was significant loss of species richness (Porter et al. 2002). Can the FKNMS be effective? Let's briefly look at the potent mixture of stressors coming in through The 3 Screen Doors (Table 1). • Can the impacts from these stressors be effectively mitigated — before the coral reef completely dies? • Should money be spent on sanctuary restoration efforts in a polluted environment? • How many more millions of dollars should United States taxpayers spend on "management" — or should they cut losses now? • How will the government explain the loss of this national treasure, and the social and economic benefits derived from it, to the public who trusted them to "protect" it? • How will this loss affect the potential designation of future MPAs and their use as a conservation tool within the United States and globally? Figure 1: Airborne African dust (brown haze) over the Caribbean Sea and western Atlantic Ocean. Dust originated in the Sahara Desert of western Africa where it was lifted and carried off the coast by strong winds. Prevailing winds carry African dust into the FKNMS primarily during June - October. Since the late 1960s, droughts and agricultural practices have increased the size of arid lands in North Africa and fueled the problem (from Griffin et al., 2002). Satellite image courtesy of NOAA. These are all tough questions that will probably have to be faced, not only by the FKNMS, but by many MPAs (some more than others) — depending on their ability to manage the three screen doors and their designated purposes (i.e. MPAs with a strictly fisheries focus may be less affected by uncontrollable sources of stress than general biodiversity type MPAs with sensitive sessile organisms, such as corals, which cannot leave the area. In summary, MPAs are unlikely to be effective if they are located in areas that are subject to numerous, and often uncontrollable, external stressors from atmospheric, terrestrial, and oceanic sources, all of which can degrade the environment and compromise protection. These critical calculations should be made before designation and periodically re-evaluated after designation. Top priority should be given to designating MPAs in minimally impaired locations that can act as reference sites for monitoring and assessment programs (Jameson et al. 1998, Jameson et al. subm.).

**Other Major Obstacles to Management Success** Whether or not an MPA can achieve its management objectives also depends greatly on the level of compliance by local resource users, who bear most of the costs of an MPA (Rudd et al. 2001). The probability of compliance will increase if local resource users derive direct benefits from the MPA (Ostrom 1990). For example, in MPAs with a fisheries



focus, for such benefits to occur they must export sufficient biomass to mitigate for the loss of fishing grounds within the MPA boundaries. To date, many studies have found substantial increases in biomass within MPAs (e.g. Russ and Alcala 1989, 1996; Polunin and Roberts 1993; Johnson et al. 1999; Roberts et al. 2001), and several studies have shown an increase in catch-per-unit-effort (CPUE) in fishing grounds adjacent to MPAs (e.g., McClanahan & Kaunda-Arara 1996; McClanahan & Mangi 2000; Roberts et al. 2001; Kelly et al. 2002). These ecological studies are cited repeatedly as evidence for the success of MPAs in fisheries and ecosystem management. In contrast, large-scale surveys of MPA users, managers and researchers paint a different picture of MPA success. It is estimated that about 35% of Caribbean MPAs and only 10-15% of Indo-Pacific MPAs are meeting their stated management objectives (Alder 1996; McClanahan 1999). Most MPAs are “paper parks” which lack compliance on the part of resource users and monitoring or enforcement on the part of management agencies. Why do such a high proportion of MPAs fail to meet their objectives? Recent research points to the level of community and institutional capacity as important determinants of MPA success (Rudd et al. 2001). Community capacity refers to the rules, procedures and values that people hold, which predispose them to work collectively for mutual benefit (Rudd 2000). Institutional capacity is the ability of government agencies to provide public goods and services and ensure that laws and regulations will be enforced. The success of MPAs as a management tool will be greatest when communities collectively support the MPA and government agencies (or in some cases, non-governmental organizations, Jameson and Williams 2000) provide the necessary financing, monitoring, enforcement, and technical expertise to ensure that MPAs reach their management objectives. For example, the Apo Island reserve in the Philippines, often considered a “poster child” for community-based MPAs, has been successful in enhancing reef fish populations and creating tourism revenue (Russ and Alcala 1996, 1999). The success of the Apo Island reserve stems from the level of community capacity, which prevented opportunistic poaching from negating MPA benefits. Alternatively, if community capacity is low (e.g. in the Turks & Caicos Islands), illegal fishing is likely to occur (Rudd et al. 2001). If community capacity is high but institutional capacity is lacking (such as in Fiji, Cooke et al. 2000), communities may be unable to prevent outsiders from poaching in their MPAs. Improving MPA institutional capacity is a difficult task. Institutional capacity can be strengthened to some extent by influxes of funding from a higher governmental level (e.g., increased federal assistance to state or territorial resource management agencies). Community capacity, on the other hand, is a function of the community’s social and cultural history, and it may be difficult to modify on time scales relevant to resource management — this is especially true in developed nations and their island territories/colonies that depend on their governments rather than their own communities for public goods and services. Another obstacle to management success is the small size of most MPAs; only 16 km<sup>2</sup> on average (McClanahan 1999). The smaller the MPA relative to the home range of the species within, the more time those species will spend outside the MPA and therefore unprotected (Kramer and Chapman 1999). However, resource users are unlikely to support MPAs large enough to effectively protect exploited species. Indeed, most MPAs are designed and located based on socioeconomic and political issues (McClanahan 1999) and rarely account for the ecology of organisms to be protected. In summary, the usefulness of appropriately sized, well-managed MPAs is not in question. What requires closer scrutiny is the institutional and community capacity necessary for effective MPA management to occur.

## **Reserves fail – designated with commercial interests in mind**

**Pressey**, Professor and Program leader for Conservation Planning at James Cook University, **13**

[Bob, The Conservation Journal, “Australia’s new marine protected areas: why they won’t work”, January 17, 2013, <http://theconversation.com/australias-new-marine-protected-areas-why-they-wont-work-11469>, ML]

On land and in the sea, we’re losing sight of what nature conservation is about. We’ve become dangerously focused on protected areas, but rarely consider what they’re supposed to achieve. One result is that biodiversity is declining almost everywhere while protected areas expand. Why the apparent paradox? An important reason is that protected areas tend to be in the wrong places. On land, it’s a safe generalisation that protected areas are biased to “residual” places - those with least promise for commercial uses. In some regions, this is because only residual landscapes survive in anything like their natural state. But another important factor is political pragmatism. Electorates in many countries like the idea of nature conservation but are undiscerning about exactly what this means. Governments can therefore present residual protected areas - and the more extensive the better - as real progress for conservation. The incentive for residual conservation is to minimise financial and political cost. As systems of marine protected areas expand, their residual nature is becoming obvious too. One of the world’s best examples of a residual system of marine protected areas was announced in November 2012 by the Australian Government. Why would residual protected areas be a problem? Most importantly, they contribute little to the real goals of nature conservation: to avert threats and avoid loss of biodiversity. They tend toward parts of jurisdictions that were de facto protected by remoteness and unsuitability for commercial uses. Meanwhile, the processes that threaten biodiversity continue largely unabated and declines in biodiversity continue. Second, by giving a false impression of conservation progress, residual protected areas use up societies’ tolerances of protection, progressively making future protected areas, especially those that might be effective in averting threats, more difficult to establish. Third, residual protected areas place the onus of real conservation on off-reserve measures. These vary greatly in effectiveness and many can be diluted, ignored, or removed at political or administrative whim. These problems mean that measuring conservation progress in terms of the extent of protected areas is usually meaningless. Another implication is that residual protected areas can produce outcomes that are worse than neutral. By failing to avert present or impending threats while pre-empting later protected areas that could be more effective, their contribution can be irretrievably negative.

## **Reserves fail to protect aquatic life – empirics prove Consortium for Ocean Leadership, 2/6**

[“Most Protected Marine Areas Fail To Properly Guard Aquatic Life: Study”, February 6, 2014, <http://oceanleadership.org/protected-marine-areas-fail-properly-guard-aquatic-life-study/>, ML]

Most Protected Marine Areas Fail To Properly Guard Aquatic Life: Study Posted on Thursday, February 6th, 2014 at 1:38 pm A diver swimming among fish on the Great Barrier Reef. (Photograph: James Cook University/AFP/Getty Images) (Click to enlarge) A diver swimming among fish on the Great Barrier Reef. (Photograph: James Cook University/AFP/Getty Images) Most of the world’s protected marine areas are failing to properly protect aquatic life, with many showing few differences from neighbouring areas that are openly fished, an Australian-led study has found. (From theguardian.com / by Oliver Milman) –

University of Tasmania research of 87 marine protected areas in 40 countries showed the best marine parks had on average eight times more large fish and 14 times more sharks than fished areas. But the research, published in *Nature*, found that 59% of the marine parks studied were “not ecologically distinguishable from fished sites”. Researchers identified five key traits of a well-managed marine park – no fish take, well enforced, established for longer than 10 years, larger than 100 square km and isolated by deep water or sand. Only marine parks with four or all five of these criteria were effectively boosting conservation values, the study found. Among the 26 marine areas studied in Australia, the only place with all five key traits was Middle Reef, near Lord Howe Island. The six-year study, which utilised scientists and divers from 19 countries, concluded that while the number of marine protected areas was increasing rapidly, the benefits generated were “difficult to predict and under debate”. “MPAs often fail to reach their full potential as a consequence of factors such as illegal harvesting, regulations that legally allow detrimental harvesting, or emigration of animals outside boundaries because of continuous habitat or inadequate size of reserve,” the paper states. “Our results show that global conservation targets based on area alone will not optimise protection of marine biodiversity. More emphasis is needed on better MPA design, durable management and compliance to ensure that MPAs achieve their desired conservation value.” Prof Graham Edgar, lead author of the report at the University of Tasmania’s Institute of Marine and Antarctic Studies, said that poor quality marine parks needed to be “retrofitted” to ensure they properly protected underwater life. “Given the huge changes now occurring out of sight under water, and our poor knowledge of exactly what is happening and how best to deal with the various threats individually, the need for protected areas that safeguard whole communities of marine species has never been greater,” he said. “What we do know is that numbers of many Australian marine species have collapsed since European settlement, including some that have disappeared. “At present, coastal zoning maps are confusing, with the few conservation gems hidden amongst protected areas that are ineffective because of inadequate regulations or poor enforcement.” In December, the Coalition government tore up management plans drawn up by Labor to create the world’s largest network marine parks off Australia’s coast. Greg Hunt, the environment minister, said the plans would have “locked out” recreational fishers from Australian waters. While the marine park boundaries would remain, new management plans would be created, dismaying environmental campaigners who pointed out that most non-fishing areas were more than 50km from population centres. The Great Barrier Reef marine park, possibly the most famous marine park in the world, is set to become the dumping site for 3m cubic metres of dredged seabed after a permit for the controversial disposal was issued last week.

## **Marine reserves fail – alt causes and current trends make reserves unsustainable**

**Bacher**, environmental journalist, **11**

[Dan, San Francisco Bay Area Independent Media Center, “UN study says biodiversity loss unstoppable with protected areas alone”, July 28, 2011,

<http://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2011/07/28/18686337.php>, ML]

Our study shows that the international community is faced with a choice between two paths," Dr. Sale says. "One option is to continue a narrow focus on creating more protected areas with little evidence that they curtail biodiversity loss. That path will fail. The other path requires that we get serious about addressing the growth in size and consumption rate of our global population." While some governments and environmental NGOs have pushed controversial "marine protected areas" in the U.S. and throughout the world as the solution to "protecting" the ocean and maintaining biodiversity in marine

ecosystems, a United Nations study released on July 28 said continued reliance on a strategy of setting aside land and marine territories as "protected areas" is "insufficient" to stem global biodiversity loss. The assessment offers a challenge to those who promote projects like Arnold Schwarzenegger's controversial Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative in California, a privately funded program that creates so-called marine protected areas that fail to protect California marine waters from oil spills and drilling, wave and wind energy projects, water pollution, habitat destruction, military testing and all other human impacts upon the ocean other than fishing and gathering. Despite impressively rapid growth of protected land and marine areas worldwide - today totalling over 100,000 in number and covering 17 million square kilometers of land and 2 million square kilometers of oceans - "biodiversity is in steep decline," according to a comprehensive assessment published in the journal Marine Ecology Progress Series. "Expected scenarios of human population growth and consumption levels indicate that cumulative human demands will impose an unsustainable toll on the Earth's ecological resources and services accelerating the rate at which biodiversity is being loss," stated a news release from the United Nations University. The scientists say current and future human requirements will also "exacerbate the challenge of effectively implementing protected areas while suggesting that effective biodiversity conservation requires new approaches that address underlying causes of biodiversity loss - including the growth of both human population and resource consumption." "Biodiversity is humanity's life-support system, delivering everything from food, to clean water and air, to recreation and tourism, to novel chemicals that drive our advanced civilization," says lead author Camilo Mora of University of Hawaii at Manoa. "Yet there is an increasingly well-documented global trend in biodiversity loss, triggered by a host of human activities." "Ongoing biodiversity loss and its consequences for humanity's welfare are of great concern and have prompted strong calls for expanding the use of protected areas as a remedy," says fellow author Peter F. Sale, Assistant Director of the United Nations University's Canadian-based Institute for Water, Environment and Health. "While many protected areas have helped preserve some species at local scales, promotion of this strategy as a global solution to biodiversity loss, and the advocacy of protection for specific proportions of habitats, have occurred without adequate assessment of their potential effectiveness in achieving the goal." Drs. Mora and Sale warn that long-term failure of the "protected areas" strategy could "erode public and political support for biodiversity conservation and that the disproportionate allocation of available resources and human capital into this strategy precludes the development of more effective approaches." The authors based their study on existing literature and global data on human threats and biodiversity loss. "Protected areas are very useful conservation tools, but unfortunately, the steep continuing rate of biodiversity loss signals the need to reassess our heavy reliance on this strategy," stated Dr. Sale. The five limitations of reliance on protected areas The study says continuing heavy reliance on the protected areas strategy has five key technical and practical limitations. The first of these limitations is that "protected areas only ameliorate certain human threats." "Biodiversity loss is triggered by a host of human stressors including habitat loss, overexploitation, climate change, pollution and invasive species," according to the study. "Yet protected areas are useful primarily against overexploitation and habitat loss. Since the remaining stressors are just as deleterious, biodiversity can be expected to continue declining as it has done until now." The study shows that approximately 83% of protected areas on the sea and 95% of protected areas on land are located in areas with continuing high impact from multiple human stressors." This conclusion by the scientists echoes one of the key criticisms of California's Marine Life Protection Act (MLPA) Initiative - the "marine protected areas" created by this widely-contested process don't comprehensively protect the ocean from the main threats to the ocean and marine life in California.

These threats include massive water diversions out of the Bay-Delta Estuary, water pollution, oil spills and drilling, wave and wind energy projects, military testing, habitat destruction and all other human impacts other than sustainable fishing and gathering. Ironically, even before the imposition of these largely redundant ocean closures that are now being contested by coalition of fishing organizations in court, California marine and anadromous fisheries had the strictest recreational and commercial fishing regulations on the entire planet. MLPA advocates refuse to acknowledge the existence of one of the largest marine protected areas in the world, the Rockfish Conservation Area, that encompass the entire continental shelf of California from the Oregon border to the Mexican border! A second limitation cited in the study is "underfunding." "Global expenditures on protected areas today are estimated at US \$6 billion per year and many areas are insufficiently funded for effective management," the assessment notes. "Effectively managing existing protected areas requires an estimated \$24 billion per year - four times current expenditure. Despite strong advocacy for protected areas, budget growth has been slow and it seems unlikely that it will be possible to raise funding appropriate for effective management as well as for creation of the additional protected areas as is advocated," according to the report. Again, the assessment echoes the criticism by fishermen and grassroots environmentalists that there is not sufficient funding for enforcement of new marine protected areas (MPAs) under the Marine Life Protection Act Initiative. The game wardens refer to these new MPAs as "marine poaching areas," since they will only spread a force of wardens already unable to effectively monitor existing reserves even thinner. In fact, Jerry Karnow, the president of the California Fish and Game Wardens Association, has repeatedly asked the California Fish and Game Commission to not create new marine protected areas unless sufficient funding is provided to hire new wardens. The three other limitations pinpointed by the scientists are: • the expected growth in protected area coverage is too slow • the size and connectivity of protected areas are inadequate • conflicts with human development. "Humanity's footprint on Earth is ever expanding in efforts to meet basic needs like housing and food," the scientists stated. "If it did prove possible to place the recommended 30% of world habitats under protection, intense conflicts with competing human interests are inevitable - many people would be displaced and livelihoods impaired. Forcing a trade-off between human development and sustaining biodiversity is unlikely to lead to a solution with biodiversity preserved." Conclusion: biodiversity loss underestimated, effectiveness of protected areas overestimated. "Given the considerable effort and widespread support for the creation of protected areas over the past 30 years, we were surprised to find so much evidence for their failure to effectively address the global problem of biodiversity loss," Dr. Mora concludes. "Clearly, the biodiversity loss problem has been underestimated and the ability of protected areas to solve this problem overestimated." The authors underline the correlations between growing world population, natural resources consumption and biodiversity loss to suggest that biodiversity loss is unlikely to be stemmed without directly addressing the ecological footprint of humanity. Based upon previous research, the study shows that under current conditions of human consumption and conservative scenarios of human population growth, the cumulative use of natural resources of humanity will amount to the productivity of up to 27 Earths by 2050.

## **2NC Congress Blocks XO**

### **Obama's XO won't even get enacted- Congress is pushing hard to block it**

Juliet **Elperin** (Writer for the Washington Post. "Pacific fishing interests oppose Obama's plan to expand marine reserve." June 30, 2014. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/06/30/pacific-fishing-interests-oppose-obamas-plan-to-expand-marine-reserve/CH>)

"They talk about this as if it's a done deal," Conathan said of the fishery council's statement. **There is also an effort underway in Congress to deny Obama the authority to create a national marine monument under the 1906 Antiquities Act**, which presidents from both parties have invoked over the past century. Last week Rep. Steve **Southerland**, a fierce critic of the administration's ocean policies, **introduced a bill that would require congressional approval for any new national monument.**

## **2NC Local Communities Turn**

### **Reserves marginalize local communities – no long term support for or sustainability of reserves**

**Christie**, School of Marine Affairs and Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies at the University of Washington, **4**

[Patrick, American Fisheries Society, "Marine Protected Areas as Biological Successes and Social Failures in Southeast Asia",

<https://depts.washington.edu/smea/sites/default/files/patrickc/MPAs.Christie.AFS%20book.2004.pdf>, ML]

The marine protected area (MPA) literature to date is mainly comprised of studies considering the biological significance of this management approach. The so-called "spill-over effect," connectivity, appropriate dimensions, and habitat representation are some of the most active areas of inquiry (e.g., Russ and Alcala 1996; Salm et al. 2000; NRC 2001; Roberts et al. 2001). As highlighted in a recent essay by seventeen social scientists, MPA research and the resultant literature is generally lacking detailed accounts of the social implications of MPAs and the activities associated with them such as fishing, recreational diving, tourism, and research (Christie et al. 2003c). This paper grew out of a conference sponsored by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) in 2002 as an attempt to fill this notable gap in MPA research and published literature (NOAA 2002). There are a few notable exceptions to this characterization (e.g., Trist 1999; Sandersen and Koester 2000; Pollnac et al. 2001), and it is clear that MPAs, and protected areas in general, are beginning to attract considerable attention by those mainly interested in the human dimensions of environmental management. The lack of social research on MPAs has led to at least two unfortunate conditions: an incomplete understanding of how to most effectively utilize this popular management tool and omissions from the scientific literature of potentially fascinating accounts of human responses to MPAs (Christie et al. 2003c; Mascia et al. 2003). One example of an omission is the general underrepresentation of conflict surrounding MPA establishment and implementation in the MPA literature. This paper will demonstrate that, in the tropics, conflict often stems from the marginalization of artisanal fisheries by other forms of resource utilization such as dive tourism. While this conflict (and its reporting) may be disconcerting to some environmentalists and scientists advocating MPAs, a careful consideration of the receptivity of fishing communities to MPAs is fundamental for their long-term success (Agardy et al. 2003). If the measure of MPA success is mainly based on biological metrics, then it is plausible that some MPAs, at least in the short term, may be considered biological successes while simultaneously causing social harm such as conflict and economic and social dislocation for disadvantaged communities (such as artisanal fishing communities near MPAs). In response, the marginalized community may either strongly resist the imposition of the MPA or initially support the MPA but then lose interest. Field research presented in this paper and other accounts demonstrates that this scenario is not uncommon and has a strong destabilizing effect on any MPA (Trist 1999; Sandersen and Koester 2000; Christie et al. 2003a, 2003b; Oracion 2003). Based on the experiences of four failing or vulnerable MPAs, this study comments on the implications of ignoring social complexities associated with MPAs. In conclusion, a case is made to improve our understanding of the complex and mixed results of MPAs thus far. The intent is to help ensure their biological and social success and to improve the likelihood that they will provide tangible benefits such as increased biodiversity and improved fisheries and tourism management.

## Failure to retain local support makes long term sustainability impossible

**Christie**, School of Marine Affairs and Henry M. Jackson School of International Studies at the University of Washington, **4**

[Patrick, American Fisheries Society, "Marine Protected Areas as Biological Successes and Social Failures in Southeast Asia",  
<https://depts.washington.edu/smea/sites/default/files/patrickc/MPAs.Christie.AFS%20book.2004.pdf>,  
ML]

Of the four well-documented MPAs in the Philippines and Indonesia that were chosen, all met standard bio-logical criteria of success more consistently than standard criteria of social success (Table 1). In general, initially successful management processes at San Salvador Island, Twin Rocks, and Balicasag Island MPA have deteriorated over time without consistent and long-term support of governmental agencies and non-governmental organizations that initially established them. Poorly managed controversy and conflict are derailing these MPAs. In Bunaken National Park, mandated by the Indonesian national government and supported with external aid, management and the enforcement of no-take areas is proceeding but in a manner that does not necessarily reflect the interests of many local fishing communities. Based on lessons from the other sites, this represents an unstable situation that likely requires corrective measures. To highlight gross similarities and differences, one point was assigned whenever a site effectively met a criterion of success (even in the most lenient sense). San Salvador: Initial Success Eroded by Interpersonal Conflict Each MPA has a unique and interesting history that helps explain the above characterizations. On San Salvador Island, initial success in community-based management (Christie and White 1994; Christie et al. 1994; White et al. 1994; Katon et al. 1999) has given way to intense interpersonal conflicts that have arisen between long-standing rivals within the community (Christie et al. 2003a). The MPA management process has become an opportunity through which such conflict, ongoing between key community leaders for more than 40 years, has expanded. While seemingly trivial (and underreported), such interpersonal conflict can have a strong detrimental impact considering the community-based nature of the management system. Established in July 1989, San Salvador Island's 125-ha no-take MPA continues to be protected by a few committed advocates from the community and a supportive local mayor. Therefore, at least until 1999, environmental conditions were improving or staying constant while the management process became increasingly tenuous (Figure 1). Species richness has increased from 126 species belonging to 19 families in 1988 to 138 species belonging to 28 families in 1998 (Christie and White 1994; Christie et al. 2003a). Some former supporters complain that advocates are unwilling to share responsibility and are heavyhanded in their methods of enforcement. As a result, the island community, which formerly appeared to be unified behind the MPA (Christie et al. 1994; Katon et al. 1999), is now clearly divided (Christie et al. 2003a). While enforcement is an important ingredient for successful programs, it is important for long-term sustainability that wide stakeholder support exists (Peluso 1992; Brechin et al. 2002; Lowe 2003). Without considerable conflict-resolution interventions, the likelihood that management will continue for another decade is unlikely based on recent interviews and comparative research on design principles for such management systems (Ostrom 1992; Pollnac et al. 2001). Twin Rocks: Initial Success Usurped by Influential Stakeholder Twin Rocks is the site of a destabilizing conflict between dive resort owners and local fishing communities (Christie et al. 2003d; Oracion 2003). In the most superficial sense, this conflict stems from disagreements over whether recreational diving—a practice formally banned by the MPA's regulations but broadly ignored by dive shop owners—should be allowed in the small no-take area



(approximately 3ha). The inter-stakeholder conflict is grounded in class distinctions and perceptions of environmental management, a phenomenon apparent in other Philippine contexts (Nazarea et al. 1998). The involved dive shop owners are generally from the capital city, much more affluent than local fishers, and politically well connected with local officials (partly as a result of election campaign contributions). As a result, these elites are able to wield greater influence over MPA management practices and have usurped control from the founding community (Peluso 1992; Trist 1999; Sandersen and Koester 2000; Lowe 2003; Oracion 2003). As of 1999, the resort owners purchased the nearshore lands and are the main enforcers of the MPA. In July 2001, one owner was particularly committed and vigilant: But what I'm telling the people in this community is, for the reef... we take care of it. [I spent] many sleepless nights [protecting the sanctuary]. I have to bear the burden of getting the ire of these people. That's okay. I don't care. As long as the fish are there. We will have to bribe people. I will resort to anything that will prevent any direct negative impact [on the sanctuary]... Predictably, fishers, who initially voluntarily protected the no-take area (over a period of 7 years) as part of the community-based management regime, are either losing interest in the MPA or are plotting how to stop diving inside the reserve and reassert their influence. When asked why they are losing interest, informants expressed a general sense of mistrust of the dive industry and concern that MPA management is no longer fair. There is a struggle for ownership over this MPA and the resort owners are perceived as having violated the tenets of community-based resource management (White et al. 1994; Pollnac et al. 2001; Oracion 2003). One community leader who dedicated years of voluntary effort has now distanced herself from this work: Now, since the resort was established they [resort owners] are the ones who guard and protect the sanctuary. But I think they already took over the sanctuary and that's the problem now... Umm, they might hear my interview. They'll be angry with me... Asked why this control was a problem as long as the sanctuary was protected, she replied, "it's the same, but the only thing is that sanctuary is for the community, now they [the resort owners] are already taking it over it." This MPA management process is suffering the fate of its own success in one community leader's opinion: "If there's good management, our coastal resources bloom. That's when divers came in. Resorts came in. But community-based management has also vanished..." Figure 2 displays data from three locations—Twin Rocks (the enforced MPA), Arthur's Rock (a non-enforced MPA due to past conflicts), and a nearby non-MPA reef. Increase in fish abundance for target species for all sites has been marginally significant since 1995 (two-way analysis of variance [ANOVA], time,  $P = 0.065$ ). There is a significant difference between sites (two-way ANOVA, site,  $P = 0.033$ ), with Twin Rocks being significantly different from non-MPA sites (Scheffé's test,  $P < 0.01$ ) but not significantly different from Arthur's Rock (Scheffé's test,  $P = 0.195$ ). Twin Rocks target fish abundance in 2001 was  $280.9 (\pm 134)$  individuals per 500 m<sup>2</sup>. Target fish abundance has remained constant for the nearby non-MPA sites since 1995. This is an indication that any "spillover" from the MPA is likely being caught by local fishers—a condition consistent with other MPAs in the Philippines (Christie et al. 2002). The greatest increase in target fish abundance for Twin Rocks took place between sampling in 1997 and 2001. A plausible conclusion is that once local resort owners took over management and enforcement of the no-take area there were immediate beneficial biological impacts. From an exclusively biological perspective, conditions at Twin Rocks are only improving. From a social perspective, such disregard for the community-based regime represents a failure. The scenario of inter-stakeholder tensions, particularly between tourist brokers and resource users, is common (West et al. 2003). In fact, it is apparent (although again underreported by some advocates) in other conservation–tourism destinations such as Soufrière, St Lucia (Trist 1999; Sandersen and Koester 2000; Roberts et al. 2001) and Bunaken National Park (Salm et al. 2000; Christie et al. 2003b;

Lowe 2003). Some MPA advocates and scientists seemingly have determined that tourism is the most effective economic engine to propel the conservation agenda forward (Nichols 1999; Trist 1999; Lowe 2003). In such cases, it appears that enforcement systems are more common than incentive-based or self-monitoring management systems based on compliance rather than enforcement (Peluso 1992; Brechin et al. 2002). While most would argue that enforcement is necessary for MPA success, the growing tendencies toward coercive mechanisms that are not compatible with other cooperative options represents a break from the early successes of community-based and co-management regimes in the Philippines and elsewhere (White and Savina 1987; White et al. 1994; Christie and White 1997; Brechin et al. 2002). Balicasag Island: Lost Community Control Has Negative Biological Impacts The insertion of central government agency control over a community-based MPA has the potential to undermine community support on Balicasag Island (Christie et al. 2002). Historically, the Philippine national government had formal control over fisheries resources. The passage of decentralization laws in the 1990s allowed community-based reserves to flourish in that context (White et al. 2002). However, the Philippines National Tourism Authority (NTA), which is an arm of the central government, has effectively laid claim to the Balicasag Island MPA. The NTA built a resort at the shores of the no-take area and now captures, along with offshore dive businesses, the majority of revenues generated by this MPA. Local residents are relegated to selling shells and t-shirts to visitors. While the NTA has stationed an armed guard at the MPA, he is unable to monitor the area effectively. Formerly supportive community members are now likely poachers, as manifested by declining fish populations inside and outside the no-take area (Christie et al. 2002). Poorly managed social dynamics have real consequences for biological resources. Fish abundances (of target species within families such as Serranidae, Lutjanidae, Lethrinidae, and Carangidae) within the no-take area have declined 291% from a peak in 1986 (one year after MPA implementation) to a low in 1999 (Christie et al. 2002). Fish abundance on the reef near the no-take area have also severely declined from 1986 ( $1,642 \pm 223$  individuals/500 m<sup>2</sup>) to 1999 ( $230 \pm 65$  individuals/500 m<sup>2</sup>). There is no longer any significant difference in fish abundance when comparing fishing areas on Balicasag (within 1 km of the no-take area) with nearby control sites where fishing is allowed, but without nearby MPAs. Even if Balicasag's MPA were effectively managed, it is likely that isolated MPAs will have a declining effect without a wider policy of fishing effort reduction in the Philippines (White et al. 2002). Initial success stories probably become magnets for increasingly desperate fishers from other areas in the Philippines. The Balicasag case provides evidence of the biological consequences of poorly functioning social

01002003004005001990 1991 1992 1993 1995 1997 2001

Year Mean number fish/500 m<sup>2</sup>

Twin Rocks Arthur's Rock Non-MPA MPAs established 2

Figure 2.—Target fish abundance change over time (mean  $\pm$  95% confidence interval). Two-way ANOVA for 1995–2001: time,  $P = 0.065$ ; site,  $P < 0.05$ ; time  $\times$  site, not significant.  $N > 5$  per site. From Christie et al. (2003d).

## **Biodiversity Core**

## **1NC Biodiversity Frontline**

### **Australia has created the world's largest marine reserve to solve the critical marine biodiversity – plan not key and international actors check**

**IUCN 12** (International Union for Conservation of Nature, "Australia creates world's largest network of marine reserves," 12-13-12, <http://www.iucn.org/about/work/programmes/marine/?11659/Australia-creates-worlds-largest-network-of-marine-reserves>)

In November 2012 the Australian Government announced the creation of the world's largest network of marine reserves. The government proclaimed 44 marine reserves a network, covering 2.3 million square kilometres, a full third of Australia's ocean territory. The reserves are home to 45 of the world's 78 whale and dolphin species, six of the seven known species of marine turtle, and 4,000 fish species. The government received support from over 500,000 Australians, who commented positively on the creation of the network. "The marine reserves will protect a diversity of Australia's ocean ecosystems, including reefs and waters in the Coral Sea, majestic seamounts off the east coast, the mysterious deep waters of the Diamantina Fracture Zone and the waters of the Great Australian Bight," said Dr. Paul Sinclair, the Healthy Ecosystems Programme Manager for the Australian Conservation Foundation. The announcement includes ocean areas that harbor some of the world's richest marine biodiversity, and the resulting network will further protect fish stocks and fragile and critical marine environments, according to Professor Ove Hoegh-Guldberg, the Director of the Global Change Institute at the University of Queensland.

### **Conservation fails to solve for biodiversity-plan is insufficient**

**Golden 14** (Abigail, correspondent for Daily Beast, 6/23/14,

<http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/06/23/republicans-obama-s-ocean-protection-plan-evidence-of-imperial-presidency.html>)

Currently, about 3 percent of the U.S.' tuna catch in the western and southern Pacific comes from the area now under protection, according to Pew Charitable Trusts. Congressman Hastings has criticized Obama for closing this area to tuna fishing, cautioning that this move will "make the U.S. tuna fleet even less viable, meaning that in the not-too-distant future all of America's tuna will be caught by foreign vessels." Paul Dalzell, a senior scientist with the Western and Central Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Council, echoed this industry-centric approach. "The islands [in the reserve] already have 50-nautical-mile boundaries around them to protect all the coral reef and shallow water habitats, so they're more than adequately protected already," Dalzell told The Daily Beast. But for migratory species like tuna, he argues, large-scale ocean reserves have little conservation value, since tuna simply swim beyond the boundaries of the closed areas to be caught by other fleets. The reserve "has no major conservation benefits, will penalize U.S. fishermen, and there's no net gain," Dalzell continued. It's worth noting that Pew Charitable Trusts, which works on ocean conservation issues, has condemned the Western and Central Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Council for its poor fisheries practices, which it claims are hastening overfishing in the Pacific region.

## **Study shows marine reserves alone don't solve biodiversity – they don't address the “bottom-up” processes that lead to species extinction**

**Jones et al 4** (Geoffrey P., Mark I. McCormick, Maya Srinivasan, and Janelle V. Eagle, Researchers of School of Marine Biology and Aquaculture, “Coral decline threatens fish biodiversity in marine reserves,” May 18, 2004)

The dramatic change in the abundance of almost all species indicates a phase-shift in reef fish community structure in response to habitat degradation and the increasing dominance of a small proportion of the original species pool. The catastrophic decline in the abundance of 50% of the species was not predicted from the initial snapshot of their ecology, because it affected far more than just coral-feeding or coral-dwelling fishes (Fig. 1). An analysis of fish settlement sites provided the most likely explanation for the community-wide change. Species varied on a continuum of those that only ever settled onto live coral substrata to those that never settled onto coral (Fig. 4). About 65% of fish species settled onto live coral in proportions significantly greater than expected because of the average coverage of live coral at these times. Furthermore, the magnitude of change in fish abundance was inversely correlated with the proportion of juveniles found settling on live coral ( $r = -0.57$ ,  $P < 0.05$ ). With a few exceptions, species that mainly settle into live coral declined, and those largely recruiting to noncoral substrata increased in abundance. Relationship between the direction and magnitude of change in fish abundance between 1997 and 2003, and the proportion of all juveniles observed to be associated with live coral at settlement. Settlement data were collected in 1999 and 2000, when the ... Reef fish communities may be more contingent on their underlying habitat than has previously been considered. Our data suggests that this dependence arises through habitat-limited recruitment (16, 21), although adult mortality through declining food and shelter may also be important. The impact on species in reef fish families less reliant on coral may be correspondingly less extreme (e.g., Lethrinidae and Lutjanidae). However, this cannot be confirmed until we know more about the settlement site preferences in these groups. The impact on small specialized families (e.g., Gobiidae and Caracanthidae) may be even more devastating. Global extinction may be imminent for some coral-dwelling gobies with restricted geographic ranges (22). The entire caracanthid family is comprised of only two obligate coral-dwelling species (Fig. 1), both of which are now extremely rare at our study sites. The magnitude of the decline in coral cover in Kimbe Bay is not atypical of other geographic locations where coral has also been largely replaced by turfing algae (1–5). The impacts of coral-algal phase-shifts on fish communities in other regions may have been similar. However, although short-term effects on coral-feeding fishes have been noted (23), the long-term effects on reef fish communities have not previously been described. Our results suggest that reefs without corals will no longer support diverse fish faunas but rather will be numerically dominated by a small subset of species preferring algal or rubble substrata. Although there is considerable potential for recovery from local disturbance through larval dispersal, the spatial extent of habitat devastation appears to be expanding rather than contracting (4, 5). If this trend cannot be reversed by management actions, species with restricted dispersal or small geographic ranges will be threatened by extinction (24–26). Although there is a large body of evidence that indicates that marine reserves can be an effective management strategy for protecting marine biodiversity (6–8), there is a growing recognition that such areas cannot protect reefs from large-scale pollution or global warming (4, 27–30). Thus, although marine reserves are necessary to control the “top-down” impact of human predation, they must be combined with management strategies that fundamentally address “bottom-up” processes that appear to be a more likely path to extinction.

## **Reserves can't promote ecosystem recovery – alt causes**

**Rosen**, Science Communication Program at the University of California Santa Cruz, **11**

[Meghan D. Mongabay, “Researchers challenge idea that marine reserves promote coral recovery”, November 9, 2011, [http://news.mongabay.com/2011/1109-ucsc\\_rosen\\_reefs.html](http://news.mongabay.com/2011/1109-ucsc_rosen_reefs.html), ML]

Fleshy whorls of thick brown algae blanket the once-vibrant corals in Glover's Reef, Belize. According to a controversial study published August 14 in the journal *Coral Reefs*, a decade of marine reserve protection has failed to help these damaged Caribbean corals recover. Healthy reefs depend on herbivorous parrotfishes to gobble up vast algal blooms. When fishing pressures overwhelm these seaweed-grazing species, tough carpets of ropy algae choke new coral growth. Research has shown that

marine reserves with strong ‘no-take’ enforcement—armed patrols, clear boundaries and daily surveillance—can protect herbivorous fish populations. However, it’s less clear whether these safeguards also help corals bounce back. Brain corals off the coast of Belize can grow up to 6 feet high. Photo by: Rhett A. Butler In 2008-2009, researchers from the University of Miami counted herbivorous fishes and measured coral growth at 87 reserved and fished sites throughout Glover’s Reef. Then, they compared their results to data collected in 1998-1999. They showed that the reserves made no difference in fish populations or coral health. Marine scientist and lead author Brittany Huntington thinks it’s important to challenge the assumption that marine reserves invariably promote coral recovery. “We need to do a better job of understanding where reserves work and where they don’t,” she told mongabay.com. “The failures are just as important to hear as the success stories.” But the findings at Glover’s Reef shouldn’t count as a failure, contends Peter Mumby, a marine ecologist at the University of Queensland in Australia. Mumby published a 2010 paper in PLoS ONE concluding that marine reserves do help Caribbean corals recover. Coral reefs off the coast of Belize are home to thousands of different species, such as this purple sea anemone. Photo by: Rhett A. Butler “If you’re going to study marine reserve impacts on coral, then you need a marine reserve that is actually doing something,” Mumby said in an interview with mongabay.com. Because the reserve at Glover’s didn’t affect fish numbers, he’s not surprised that corals didn’t recover. He thinks parrotfish poachers may still be plundering reserves, despite beefed-up enforcement by the Belizean government. Both Mumby and Huntington acknowledged that different reef environments could account for the different study outcomes: he looked in the Bahamas, she in Belize. However, Mumby thinks it’s misleading to conclude that reserves don’t benefit corals. He said environmental stressors during the study, such as hurricanes and unusually warm waters, could have obscured coral recovery at Glover’s. Mumby thinks Huntington’s paper might send a false message that marine reserve science is murky or inconsistent. But Huntington believes Glover’s is an ideal place to document that reserves can work for some species (like conch and lobster) while not for others (like fish and corals). She envisions a multi-pronged management approach to help Caribbean corals cope with environmental and human-inflicted hazards. This might mean merging traditional strategies with more experimental ideas, such as physically transplanting healthy corals onto damaged reefs. Already, the absence of algae-munching fish at Glover’s has shifted the balance of coral species from the massive “broadcasters” that tower above the ocean floor and build the framework of the reef to the runty “brooders” that sprout like underwater weeds. Shrimp, starfish, and thousands of other sea-dwelling species depend on colossal reef structures for housing and meals. “If we lose our big builders,” Huntington said, “how can we expect to have healthy, structurally complex reefs in the Caribbean?”

## **Turn – reserves make ecosystems less resilient to climate change**

**Cote et al**, Professor of Tropical Marine Ecology at Simon Fraser University, **10**

[Isabelle, Simon Fraser University, “Marine reserves fail to protect coral reefs”, [http://www.sfu.ca/archive-pamr/media\\_releases/media\\_releases\\_archives/marine-reserves-fail-to-protect-coral-reefs.html](http://www.sfu.ca/archive-pamr/media_releases/media_releases_archives/marine-reserves-fail-to-protect-coral-reefs.html), August 4, 2010, ML]

Marine reserves not only fail to give tropical reefs a fighting chance against climate change but may also increase their vulnerability to it according to Simon Fraser University researchers. In a paper recently published in The Public Library of Science Biology, tropical marine biologists Isabelle Côté and Emily Darling dispute the widely held theory that imposing protective measures, such as fishing bans and

pollution control, helps coral reefs cope with climate change. Côté is globally recognized as a pioneer in using meta-analysis (mass scientific data analysis) to create a big picture of the fate of the world's coral reefs. "Marine reserves do not prevent major coral loss associated with bleaching and climate change," says Côté, who approximates the number of reserves worldwide at 6,000. "In many cases, protected reefs seem to be even more vulnerable than unprotected ones." Côté and Darling believe that marine reserves may foster the growth of coral species that are extremely sensitive to bleaching, a type of tissue loss that kills corals. "The corals that occur outside of reserves seem to tolerate temperature stress and bleaching better, likely because they are used to living in a stressful environment," adds Darling. "This means that instead of increasing reef resilience to climate change, marine reserves may actually increase reef vulnerability by protecting temperature-sensitive species."

## **Alt cause – global warming is the greatest cause of biodiversity loss**

**Butler**, Australian eco-socialist, 13

[Simon, Climate & Capitalism, "Oceans on the brink of ecological collapse", October 14, 2013, <http://climateandcapitalism.com/2013/10/14/oceans-brink-ecological-collapse/>, ML]

Marine scientists say the health of the oceans is in crisis. A 'deadly trio' of emission impacts may have already initiated a mass extinction event, a mass die-off of species and catastrophic loss of biodiversity. In late September, many mainstream media outlets gave substantial coverage to the UN's new report on the climate change crisis, which said the Earth's climate is warming faster than at any point in the past 65 million years and that human activity is the cause. It was disappointing, though not surprising, that news reports dried up after only a few days. But another major scientific study, released a week later and including even graver warnings of a global environmental catastrophe, was mostly ignored altogether. The marine scientists that released the State of the Ocean 2013 report on October 3 gave the starkest of possible warnings about the impact of carbon pollution on the oceans: "We are entering an unknown territory of marine ecosystem change, and exposing organisms to intolerable evolutionary pressure. The next mass extinction event may have already begun. Developed, industrialised human society is living above the carrying capacity of the Earth, and the implications for the ocean, and thus for all humans, are huge." Report co-author, Professor Alex Rogers of Somerville College, Oxford, said on October 3: "The health of the ocean is spiralling downwards far more rapidly than we had thought. We are seeing greater change, happening faster, and the effects are more imminent than previously anticipated. The situation should be of the gravest concern to everyone since everyone will be affected by changes in the ability of the ocean to support life on Earth." The ocean is by far the Earth's largest carbon sink and has absorbed most of the excess carbon pollution put into the atmosphere from burning fossil fuels. The State of the Ocean 2013 report warned that this is making decisive changes to the ocean itself, causing a "deadly trio of impacts" – acidification, ocean warming and deoxygenation (a fall in ocean oxygen levels). The report said: "Most, if not all, of the Earth's five past mass extinction events have involved at least one of these three main symptoms of global carbon perturbations [or disruptions], all of which are present in the ocean today." Fossil records indicate five mass extinction events have taken place in the Earth's history. The biggest of these – the end Permian mass extinction – wiped out as much as 95% of marine life about 250 million years ago. Another, far better known mass extinction event wiped out the dinosaurs about 66 million years ago and is thought to have been caused by a huge meteor strike. A further big species extinction took place 55 million years ago. Known as the

Paleocene/Eocene thermal maximum (PETM), it was a period of rapid global warming associated with a huge release of greenhouse gases. “Today’s rate of carbon release,” said the State of the Ocean 2013, “is at least 10 times faster than that which preceded the [PETM].”[1] Ocean acidification is a sign that the increase in CO<sub>2</sub> is surpassing the ocean’s capacity to absorb it. The more acid the ocean becomes, the bigger threat it poses to marine life – especially sea creatures that form their skeletons or shells from calcium carbonate such as crustaceans, molluscs, corals and plankton. The report predicts “extremely serious consequences for ocean life” if the release of CO<sub>2</sub> does not fall, including “the extinction of some species and decline in biodiversity overall.” Acidification is taking place fastest at higher latitudes, but overall the report says “geological records indicate that the current acidification is unparalleled in at least the last 300 million years”. Ocean warming is the second element in the deadly trio. Average ocean temperatures have risen by 0.6°C in the past 100 years. As the ocean gets warmer still, it will help trigger critical climate tipping points that will warm the entire planet even faster, hurtling it far beyond the climate in which today’s life has evolved. Ocean warming will accelerate the death spiral of polar sea ice and risks the “increased venting of the greenhouse gas methane from the Arctic seabed”, the report says. Ongoing ocean warming will also wreak havoc on marine life. The report projects the “loss of 60% of present biodiversity of exploited marine life and invertebrates, including numerous local extinctions.” Each decade, fish are expected to migrate between 30 kilometres to 130 kilometres towards the poles, and live 3.5 metres deeper underwater, leading to a 40% fall in fish catch potential in tropical regions. The report says: “All these changes will have massive economic and food security consequences, not least for the fishing industry and those who depend on it.” The combined effects of acidification and ocean warming will also seal the fate of the world’s coral reefs, leading to their “terminal and rapid decline” by 2050. Australia’s Great Barrier Reef and Caribbean Sea reefs will likely “shift from coral domination to algal domination.” The report says the global target to limit the average temperature rise to 2°C, which was adopted at the Copenhagen UN climate conference in 2009, “is not sufficient for coral reefs to survive. Lower targets should be urgently pursued.” Deoxygenation – the third component of the deadly trio – is related to ocean warming and to high levels of nutrient run-off into the ocean from sewerage and agriculture. The report says overall ocean oxygen levels, which have declined consistently for the past five decades, could fall by 1% to 7% by 2100. But this figure does not indicate the big rise in the number of low oxygen “dead zones,” which has doubled every decade since the 1960s. Whereas acidification most impacts upon smaller marine life, deoxygenation hits larger animals, such as Marlin and Tuna, hardest. The report cautions that the combined impact of this deadly trio will “have cascading consequences for marine biology, including altered food webs dynamics and the expansion of pathogens [causing disease].” It also warns that it adds to other big problems affecting the ocean, such as chemical pollution and overfishing (up to 70% of the world’s fish stock is overfished). “We may already have entered into an extinction period and not yet realised it. What is certain is that the current carbon perturbations will have huge implications for humans, and may well be the most important challenge faced since the hominids evolved. The urgent need to reduce the pressure of all ocean stressors, especially CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, is well signposted.”

## **Species adapt and migrate**

**Thompson et al 09** [Ian, Canadian Forest Service, Brendan Mackey, The Australian National University, The Fenner School of Environment and Society, College of Medicine, Biology and Environment, Steven McNulty, USDA Forest Service, Alex Mosseler, Canadian Forest Service, 2009,



Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity “Forest Resilience, Biodiversity, and Climate Change” Convention on Biological Diversity] WD

While resilience can be attributed to many levels of organization of biodiversity, the **genetic composition of species is the most fundamental**. Molecular genetic diversity within a species, species diversity within a forested community, and community ecosystem diversity across a landscape and bioregion represent expressions of biological diversity at different scales. The basis of all expressions of biological diversity is the genotypic variation found in populations. **The individuals that comprise populations at each level of ecological organization are subject to natural selection and contribute to the adaptive capacity or resilience of tree species and forest ecosystems** (Muller-Starck et al. 2005). **Diversity at each of these levels has fostered natural (and artificial) regeneration of forest ecosystems and facilitated their adaptation to dramatic climate changes** that occurred during the quaternary period (review by: DeHayes et al. 2000); this diversity must be maintained in the face of anticipated changes from anthropogenic climate warming. Genetic diversity (e.g., additive genetic variance) within a species is important because it is the basis for the natural selection of genotypes within populations and species as they respond or adapt to environmental changes (Fisher 1930, Pitelka 1988, Pease et al. 1989, Burger and Lynch 1995, Burdon and Thrall, 2001, Etterson 2004, Reusch et al. 2005, Schaberg et al. 2008). The potential for evolutionary change has been demonstrated in numerous long-term programmes based on artificial selection (Falconer 1989), and genetic strategies for reforestation in the presence of rapid climate change must focus on maintaining species diversity and genetic diversity within species (Ledig and Kitzmiller 1992). In the face of rapid environmental change, it is important to understand that the **genetic diversity and adaptive capacity of forested ecosystems depends largely on in situ genetic variation within each population of a species** (Bradshaw 1991). Populations exposed to a rate of environmental change exceeding the rate at which populations can adapt, or disperse, may be doomed to extinction (Lynch and Lande 1993, Burger and Lynch 1995). Genetic diversity determines the range of fundamental eco-physiological tolerances of a species. It governs inter-specific competitive interactions, which, together with dispersal mechanisms, constitute the fundamental determinants of potential species responses to change (Pease et al. 1989, Halpin 1997). In the past, **plants have responded to dramatic changes in climate both through adaptation and migration** (Davis and Shaw 2001). **The capacity for long-distance migration of plants by seed dispersal is particularly important in the event of rapid environmental change. Most, and probably all, species are capable of long-distance seed dispersal, despite morphological dispersal syndromes that would indicate morphological adaptations primarily for short-distance dispersal** (Cwynier and MacDonald 1986, Higgins et al. 2003). Assessments of mean migration rates found no significant differences between wind and animal dispersed plants (Wilkinson 1997, Higgins et al. 2003). Long-distance migration can also be strongly influenced by habitat suitability (Higgins and Richardson 1999) suggesting that **rapid migration may become more frequent and visible with rapid changes in habitat suitability under scenarios of rapid climate change**. The discrepancy between estimated and observed migration rates during re-colonization of northern temperate forests following the retreat of glaciers can be accounted for by the underestimation of long-distance dispersal rates and events (Brunet and von Oheimb 1998, Clark 1998, Cain et al. 1998, 2000). Nevertheless, concerns persist that potential migration and adaptation rates of many tree species may not be able to keep pace with projected global warming (Davis 1989, Huntley 1991, Dyer 1995, Collingham et al. 1996, Malcolm et al. 2002). However, these models refer to fundamental niches and generally ignore the ecological interactions that also govern species distributions.

## **Alt cause – climate**

**Thompson et al 09** [Ian, Canadian Forest Service, Brendan Mackey, The Australian National University, The Fenner School of Environment and Society, College of Medicine, Biology and Environment, Steven McNulty, USDA Forest Service, Alex Mosseler, Canadian Forest Service, 2009, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity “Forest Resilience, Biodiversity, and Climate Change” Convention on Biological Diversity] WD

Superimposed on the many other anthropogenic impacts on forest ecosystems noted above is humanforced global climate change. Climate has a major influence on rates of photosynthesis and respiration (Woodward et al. 1995, Kueppers et al. 2004, Law et al. 2007), and on other forest processes, acting through temperature, radiation, and moisture regimes over medium and long time periods. Climate and weather conditions also directly influence shorter-term processes in forests, such as frequency of storms and wildfires, herbivory, and species migration (Gundersen and Holling 2002). As the global climate changes, forest ecosystems will change because species' physiological tolerances may be exceeded and the rates of biophysical forest processes will be altered (Olesen et al. 2007, Kellomaki et al. 2008, Malhi et al. 2008). Forests can be usefully conceived

## Environment impacts are exaggerated

**Gordon 95** [Richard, professor of mineral economics at Pennsylvania State University, "Ecorealism Exposed," Regulation, 1995, <http://www.cato.org/pubs/regulation/regv18n3/reg18n3-readings.html>] WD

Easterbrook's argument is that although environmental problems deserve attention, the environmental movement has exaggerated the threats and ignored evidence of improvement. His discontent causes him to adopt and incessantly employ the pejoratively intended (and irritating) shorthand "enviros" to describe the leading environmental organizations and their admirers. He proposes-and overuses-an equally infelicitous alternative phrase, "ecorealism," that seems to mean that most environmental initiatives can be justified by more moderate arguments. Given the mass, range, and defects of the book, any review of reasonable length must be selective. Easterbrook's critique begins with an overview of environmentalism from a global perspective. He then turns to a much longer (almost 500- page) survey of many specific environmental issues. The overview section is a shorter, more devastating criticism, but it is also more speculative than the survey of specific issues. In essence, the overview argument is that human impacts on the environment are minor, easily correctable influences on a world affected by far more powerful forces. That is a more penetrating criticism than typically appears in works expressing skepticism about environmentalism. Easterbrook notes that mankind's effects on nature long predate industrialization or the white colonization of America, but still have had only minor impacts. We are then reminded of the vast, often highly destructive changes that occur naturally and the recuperative power of natural systems.

## **2NC Don't Solve Biodiversity**

**Marine reserves don't help biodiversity and even have negative impacts for biodiversity – their studies are flawed**

**Hilborn 4-12-14** (Ray, Marine biologist, fisheries scientist, and professor of aquatic and fishery science, "Protecting Marine Biodiversity with 'New' Conservation," The Nature Conservancy, April 12, 2014, <http://blog.nature.org/science/2014/04/12/nature-longread-protecting-marine-biodiversity-new-conservation-ray-hilborn/> accessed 6/24/14)

The protected-area approach in marine conservation has two major disadvantages. The first problem is effort displacement. When an area is closed to fishing, the vessels move elsewhere, adding fishing pressure to some areas that potentially equals or outweighs the benefits seen in the protected areas (Pastoors et al. 2000). Hamilton et al. (2010) found that abundance of target species declined outside reserves and increased inside reserves, yielding no net increase in abundance. The second biodiversity problem is a reduction in the total sustainable yield of fish stocks when marine reserves are large. This loss will almost certainly be made up by some other form of food production with negative biodiversity consequences (Hilborn 2013). At the extreme, if lost fish production is compensated by cutting rainforest to grow crops or cattle, we can be very sure that the total biodiversity consequences will be negative.

## 2NC Adapt and Migrate

**Changes in biodiversity are both inevitable and unstoppable—your impacts are empirically disproven.**

**Dodds 2k**—Donald J. Dodds is the former president of the North Pacific Research Board, M.S. and P.E. (“The Myth of Biodiversity,” Published in 2000, Available Online at <http://www.docstoc.com/docs/97436583/THE-MYTH-OF-BIODIVERSITY>)

Biodiversity is a corner stone of the environmental movement. But there is no proof that biodiversity is important to the environment. Something without basis in scientific fact is called a Myth. Lets examine biodiversity through out the history of the earth. The earth has been around for about 4 billion years. Life did not develop until about 500 million years later. Thus for the first 500 million years bio diversity was zero. The planet somehow survived this lack of biodiversity. For the next 3 billion years, the only life on the planet was microbial and not diverse. Thus, the first unexplainable fact is that the earth existed for 3.5 billion years, 87.5% of its existence, without biodiversity. Somewhere around 500 million years ago life began to diversify and multiple celled species appeared. Because these species were partially composed of sold material they left better geologic records, and the number of species and genera could be cataloged and counted. The number of genera on the planet is a indication of the biodiversity of the planet. Figure 1 is a plot of the number of genera on the planet over the last 550 million years. The little black line outside of the left edge of the graph is 10 million years. Notice the left end of this graph. Biodiversity has never been higher than it is today. Notice next that at least ten times biodiversity fell rapidly; none of these extreme reductions in biodiversity were caused by humans. Around 250 million years ago the number of genera was reduce 85 percent from about 1200 to around 200, by any definition a significant reduction in biodiversity. Now notice that after this extinction a steep and rapid rise of biodiversity. In fact, if you look closely at the curve, you will find that every mass-extinction was followed by a massive increase in biodiversity. Why was that? Do you suppose it had anything to do with the number environmental niches available for exploitation? If you do, you are right. Extinctions are necessary for creation Each time a mass extinction occurs the world is filled with new and better-adapted species. That is the way evolution works, its called survival of the fittest. Those species that could not adapted to the changing world conditions simply disappeared and better species evolved. How efficient is that? Those that could adapt to change continued to thrive. For example, the cockroach and the shark have been around well over 300 million years. There is a pair to draw to, two successful species that any creator would be proud to produce. To date these creatures have successful survived six extinctions, without the aid of humans or the EPA. Now notice that only once in the last 500 million years did life ever exceed 1500 genera, and that was in the middle of the Cretaceous Period around 100 million years ago, when the dinosaurs exploded on the planet. Obviously, biodiversity has a bad side. The direct result of this explosion in biodiversity was the extinction of the dinosaurs that followed 45 million years later at the KT boundary. It is interesting to note, that at the end of the extinction the number of genera had returned to the 1500 level almost exactly. Presently biodiversity is at an all time high and has again far exceeded the 1500 genera level. Are we over due for another extinction? A closer look at the KT extinction 65 million years ago reveals at least three things. First the 1500 genera that remained had passed the test of environmental compatibility and remained on the planet. This was not an accident. Second, these extinctions freed niches for occupation by better-adapted species. The remaining genera now faced an environment with hundreds of thousands of vacant niches. Third, it only took about 15 million years to refill all of those niches and completely replaced the dinosaurs, with new and better species. In this context, a better species is by definition one that is more successful in dealing with a changing environment. Many of those genera that survived the KT extinction were early mammals, a more sophisticated class of life that had developed new and better ways of facing the environment. These genera were now free to expand and diversify without the presences of the life dominating dinosaurs. Thus, as a direct result of this mass extinction humans are around to discuss the consequences of change. If the EPA had prevented the dinosaur extinction, neither the human race, nor the EPA would have existed. The unfortunate truth is that the all-powerful human species does not yet have the intelligence or the knowledge to regulate evolution. It is even questionable that they have the skills to prevent their own extinction. Change is a vital part of the environment. A successful species is one that can adapt to the changing environment, and the most successful species is one that can do that for the longest duration. This brings us back to the cockroach and the shark. This of course dethrones egotistical homosapien-sapiens as god’s finest creation, and raises the cockroach to that exalted position. A fact that is difficult for the vain to accept. If humans are to replace the cockroach, we need to use our most important adaptation (our brain) to prevent our own extinction. Humans like the Kola bear have become over specialized, we require a complex energy consuming social system to exist. If one thing is constant in the

universe, it is change. The planet has change significantly over the last 4 billion years and it will continue to change over the next 4 billion years. The current human scheme for survival, stopping change, is a not only wrong, but futile because stopping change is impossible. Geologic history has repeatedly shown that species that become overspecialized are ripe for extinction. A classic example of overspecialization is the Kola bears, which can only eat the leaves from a single eucalyptus tree. But because they are soft and furry, look like a teddy bear and have big brown eyes, humans are artificially keeping them alive. Humans do not have the stomach or the brain for controlling evolution. Evolution is a simple process or it wouldn't function. Evolution works because it follows the simple law: what works—works, what doesn't work—goes away. There is no legislation, no regulations, no arbitration, no lawyers, scientists or politicians. Mother Nature has no preference, no prejudices, no emotions and no ulterior motives. Humans have all of those traits. Humans are working against nature when they try to prevent extinctions and freeze biodiversity. Examine the curve in figure one, at no time since the origin of life has biodiversity been constant. If this principal has worked for 550 million years on this planet, and science is supposed to find truth in nature, by what twisted reasoning can fixing biodiversity be considered science? Let alone good for the environment. Environmentalists are now killing species that they arbitrarily term invasive, which are in reality simply better adapted to the current environment. Consider the Barred Owl, a superior species is being killed in the name of biodiversity because the Barred Owl is trying to replace a less environmentally adapted species the Spotted Owl. This is more harmful to the ecosystem because it impedes the normal flow of evolution based on the idea that biodiversity must remain constant. Human scientists have decided to take evolution out of the hands of Mother Nature and give it to the EPA. Now there is a good example of brilliance. We all know what is wrong with lawyers and politicians, but scientists are supposed to be trustworthy. Unfortunately, they are all to often, only people who think they know more than anybody else. Abraham Lincoln said, "Those who know not, and know not that the know not, are fools shun them." Civilization has fallen into the hands of fools. What is suggested by geologic history is that the world has more biodiversity than it ever had and that it maybe overdue for another major extinction. Unfortunately, today many scientists have too narrow a view. They are highly specialized. They have no time for geologic history. This appears to be a problem of inadequate education not ignorance. What is abundantly clear is that artificially enforcing rigid biodiversity works against the laws of nature, and will cause irreparable damage to the evolution of life on this planet and maybe beyond. The world and the human species may be better served if we stop trying to prevent change, and begin trying to understand change and positioning the human species to that it survives the inevitable change of evolution. If history is to be believed, the planet has 3 times more biodiversity than it had 65 million years ago. Trying to sustain that level is futile and may be dangerous. The next major extinction, change in biodiversity, is as inevitable as climate change. We cannot stop either from occurring, but we can position the human species to survive those changes.

## Alternate cause—deforestation

**Cardillo 6** – Dr. Marcel Cadillo Proffesor in the Biology Divison at Imperial College London (2006, Dr. Marcel Cadillo, "Disapearing Forests and Biodiversity Loss: Which areas should we protect?," International Forestry Review, Vol. 8, pp. 251-255)

Forests are the most biodiverse terrestrial habitats on earth. Despite a growing awareness that biodiversity and properly-functioning natural ecosystems make a crucial contribution to human wellbeing (Rashid et al. 2003), deforestation is proceeding at a rapid pace throughout much of the world. In Brazil, for example, more forest was lost in the 16 years up to 2004 than in all the preceding centuries. With massive investments in roads, dams and other economic infrastructure International Forestry Review Vol.8(2), 2006 251252 M. Cardillo on the drawing board, it is predicted that 40% of remaining forest in the Amazon basin will be lost by 2050 (Soares-Filho et al. 2006). In other heavily-forested countries, such as Indonesia and Papua New Guinea, deforestation rates are also at historically high levels (FAO 2006).

## No impact to biodiversity loss – balanced by arrival of new species

**Biello, 4/20**

[David, Scientific American, "Biodiversity Survives Extinctions for Now", April 20, 2014, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode/biodiversity-survives-extinctions-for-now1/>, ML]

We are living during what seem to be the opening stages of the sixth mass extinction in our planet's 4.5 billion year history. Species of birds, fish, mammals and plants are disappearing at speeds rarely experienced, thanks in large part to human activities: pollution, climate change, habitat destruction and other damage. But extinction apparently does not mean less biodiversity—at least not yet. A new look at ecosystems from the poles to the tropics shows that losses in the number of species in any given place do not yet translate to large changes in the overall number of different species there. The study is in the journal Science. [Maria Dornelas et al, Assemblage Time Series Reveal Biodiversity Change but Not Systematic Loss] The researchers analyzed 100 surveys that followed more than 35,000 different species over various lengths of time. These long-term studies found that the number of different species in, say, a coral reef remains relatively constant. Because the loss of a species, either locally or entirely, is often balanced by the arrival of a new species. The meta-analysis showed that 40 percent of places had more species present, 40 percent had less and 20 percent were unchanged. In other words, the ecosystems of the current Anthropocene era are transformed, but just as diverse—so far anyway. We are living in a world of novel ecosystems.

## **2NC Alt Causes**

### **Alt causes to biodiversity loss**

#### **EEA, 10**

[European Environment Agency, “Marine biodiversity: life in seas under threat”, <http://www.eea.europa.eu/highlights/marine-biodiversity-life-in-seas>, ML]

The key threats are known Fourth in the series of '10 messages for 2010', the EEA's assessment highlights some key pressures on marine ecosystems: eutrophication — increased concentrations of chemical nutrients, resulting mainly from intensive agriculture on land, continue to be a major problem affecting most European seas; pollution — although concentrations of hazardous substances are decreasing, their persistence and the large amounts already released mean that negative effects will continue for decades; climate change — impacts on marine biodiversity and ecosystems are becoming more and more obvious: sea surface temperatures and sea levels are rising; sea-ice cover is decreasing; and the chemical, physical and biological characteristics of the sea are changing; invasive alien species — combined with other pressures such as overfishing, acidification and climate change, introduction of invasive alien species can alter entire ecosystems.

### **Alt cause – ocean acidification**

#### **Oceana, 12**

[“Effects of Ocean Acidification on Marine Species & Ecosystems”, <http://oceana.org/en/our-work/climate-energy/ocean-acidification/learn-act/effects-of-ocean-acidification-on-marine-species-ecosystems>, ML]

Marine animals interact in complex food webs that may be disrupted by ocean acidification due to losses in key species that will have trouble creating calcium carbonate shells in acidified waters. Some species of calcifying plankton that are threatened by ocean acidification form the base of marine food chains and are important sources of prey to many larger organisms. Tiny swimming sea snails called pteropods are considered the ‘potato chips of the sea’ as they serve as a critical part of the arctic marine food web, ultimately feeding whales and other top predators. Pteropod shells are expected to dissolve in acidity levels predicted by the end of this century and may not be able to survive. Population crashes or changes in the distribution of pteropods would have serious implications for some of the most abundant marine ecosystems. Other important calcifying species have been witnessed to have troubles in acidified waters. Sea urchins are important grazers and can help to protect coral reefs from encroaching algae. Young sea urchins have been observed to grow slower and have thinner, smaller, misshapen protective shells when raised in acidified conditions, like those expected to exist by the year 2100. Slower growth rates and deformed shells may leave urchins more vulnerable to predators and decrease their ability to survive. Furthermore, under acidified conditions the sperm of some sea urchins swim more slowly, this reduces their chances of finding and fertilizing an egg, forming an embryo and developing into sea urchin larvae. Brittle stars, which are important burrowers and prey items for flatfish, appear to be very vulnerable to increasing ocean acidity both as adults and larvae, which could result in severe population declines in the future. In acidified conditions, adult brittle stars lose muscle mass when regenerating their arms and many if not all brittle star larvae will not survive. Even marine

animals that do not create calcium carbonate shells or skeletons may be threatened by the increasing acidity of the oceans. Squid are the fastest invertebrates in the oceans and require high levels of oxygen for their high-energy swimming. Increasingly acidic oceans interfere with the acidity of a squid's blood and consequently the amount of oxygen that it can carry. Squid are important prey for many marine mammals, including beaked and sperm whales. Squid fisheries are also the most lucrative fishery in California accounting for 25 million dollars in revenues in 2008. Some marine fishes have also shown vulnerability to acidification. While adult fish may be relatively insensitive to ocean acidification, their eggs and larvae may not be able to develop properly due to changes in ocean chemistry. Clownfish and damselfish larvae have shown a reduced sense of smell in acidified conditions which led to riskier swimming behavior. Increased levels of carbon dioxide have been associated with these fish being more active, swimming further away from shelter and not responding to threats such as predators. In studies, five to nine times more fish died because of their risky behavior than those not in acidified conditions. As the acidity of the ocean increases, they are simultaneously getting warmer due to climate change. These factors, when combined, may create even more problems than either would create independently. For example, increased temperature combined with the acidity levels expected by the end of this century proved lethal for one species of cardinalfish tested in the laboratory. There will likely be some species that are able to flourish in an acidified ocean, either because increased carbon dioxide levels benefit them directly or because their competitors are directly harmed by it. The only problem is that the species that appear to be best suited to prosper in high-carbon dioxide conditions, such as jellyfish and algae, are those that we currently see as nuisance, or weedy species. In an acidified ocean there will be ecological winners and losers, but overall, marine ecosystems may change for the worse. They may become less vibrant and diverse, devoid of the animals we love and depend upon and full of those that present less value. As ocean chemistry continues to change, the many goods and services they provide could dwindle, forcing millions of people to find new food sources, new homes and new sources of income. Adapting to these losses will take huge resources from the global community and in some cases adaptation will not be possible. A smarter future is one where we reduce carbon dioxide emissions, transition to cleaner, renewable sources of energy and prevent the need for large-scale adaptation.

### **Alt cause – pollution**

**Mustafa**, Assistant Professor in the Legal Practice Department at the International Islamic University Malaysia, **and Ariffin**, Faculty of Environmental Studies in the Department of Environmental Management at Universiti Putra Malaysia, **11**

[Maizatun and Mariani, International Journal of Bioscience, Biochemistry and Bioinformatics, Vol. 1 No. 4, "Protection of Marine Biodiversity from Pollution: Legal Strategies in Malaysia", November 2011, <http://www.ijbbb.org/papers/52-B106.pdf>, ML]

Over the years, Malaysia's marine environment continues to face serious pressure particularly due to pollution. Manuscript received November 18, 2011; revised November 30, 2011. Maizatun Mustafa is with the Legal Practice Department, Ahmad Ibrahim Kulliyah of Laws, International Islamic University Malaysia, Jalan Gombak 53100 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (e-mail: maizatun@iium.edu.my). Mariani Ariffin is with the Department of Environmental Management, Faculty of Environmental Studies, Universiti



Putra Malaysia, 43400 Serdang Selangor Malaysia (e-mail: mariani@env.upm.edu.my). Pollution from land-based sources, mainly as consequences of urbanization and industrialization along the coastal areas of Malaysia, has been identified as the major contributors towards marine pollution [2]. Another source of marine pollution is that of vessel-based. By virtue of its geographical location, Malaysia is strategically located at the conjunction of the Straits of Malacca and the South China Sea, which serve as a major commercial shipping route between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean. The Straits of Malacca is most susceptible to vessel-based marine pollution such as oil and grease especially in recent years due to the heavy volume of shipping that uses it [2]. In the year 2010 alone, more than 75000 vessels have passed through the Straits [3]. Thus, vessels discharges such as tank cleaning, deballasting, bilging and bunkering are the most significant activities contributing to the oil and grease in the marine water. With the expansion of world trade, the traffic volume was expected to increase rapidly which would significantly increase the risk of vessels accidents and marine pollution. By nature, oil is toxic to marine life. If oil spill reaches the shoreline, it interacts with sediments, vegetation, and habitats of wildlife and humans, causing erosion and contamination. Oil spill could remain for years in the sediment and marine environment, causing long-term effects to the marine biodiversity. It is important for Malaysia to address the threats posed by the land-based and vessel-based pollution to ensure the sustainability of marine biodiversity [4].

## **Alt cause – pollution**

### **Center for Biological Diversity, 12**

["OCEAN PLASTICS POLLUTION: A GLOBAL TRAGEDY FOR OUR OCEANS AND SEA LIFE", August 2012, [http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/ocean\\_plastics/](http://www.biologicaldiversity.org/campaigns/ocean_plastics/), ML]

Plastic never goes away. And it's increasingly finding its way into our oceans and onto our beaches. In the Los Angeles area alone, 10 metric tons of plastic fragments — like grocery bags, straws and soda bottles — are carried into the Pacific Ocean every day. Today billions of pounds of plastic can be found in swirling convergences making up about 40 percent of the world's ocean surfaces. Plastics pollution has a direct and deadly effect on wildlife. Thousands of seabirds and sea turtles, seals and other marine mammals are killed each year after ingesting plastic or getting entangled in it. Endangered wildlife like Hawaiian monk seals and Pacific loggerhead sea turtles are among nearly 300 species that eat and get caught in plastic litter. It's time to get at the root of this ocean crisis. The Center has petitioned the Environmental Protection Agency to begin regulating plastics as a pollutant under the Clean Water Act — a crucial first step in reducing the amount of plastic littering the oceans. We've also petitioned to designate the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands as a Superfund site. Read more about our campaign. We need your help to get the EPA to do the right thing. Please take action today by signing our petition — and also, please sign up to get our email alerts. THE PLASTIC PROBLEM We're surrounded by plastic. Think about every piece you touch in a single day: grocery bags, food containers, coffee cup lids, drink bottles, straws for juice boxes — the list goes on and on. Plastic may be convenient, but its success carries a steep price. In the first decade of this century, we made more plastic than all the plastic in history up to the year 2000. And every year, billions of pounds of plastic end up in the world's oceans. Most ocean pollution starts out on land and is carried by wind and rain to the sea. Once in the water, there is a near-continuous accumulation of waste. Plastic is so durable that the EPA reports "every bit of plastic ever made still exists." Due to its low density, plastic waste is readily transported long distances from source areas and concentrates in gyres, systems of rotating ocean currents. The North Pacific Gyre,

also known as the Great Pacific Garbage Patch, is twice the size of Texas (and growing) and consists mostly of small plastic particles suspended at, or just below, the surface, where fish and other animals mistake the particles for food. In the Garbage Patch, plastic outnumbers fish food like zooplankton six to one. The Garbage Patch is only one of five such convergence zones, which in total cover 40 percent of the ocean. A HEAVY TOLL ON WILDLIFE Thousands of animals, from small finches to great white sharks, die grisly deaths from eating and getting caught in plastic: Fish in the North Pacific ingest 12,000 to 24,000 tons of plastic each year, which can cause intestinal injury and death and transfers plastic up the food chain to bigger fish and marine mammals. Sea turtles also mistake floating plastic garbage for food. While plastic bags are the most commonly ingested item, loggerhead sea turtles have been found with soft plastic, ropes, Styrofoam, and monofilament lines in their stomachs. Ingestion of plastic can lead to blockage in the gut, ulceration, internal perforation and death; even if their organs remain intact, turtles may suffer from false sensations of satiation and slow or halt reproduction. Hundreds of thousands of seabirds ingest plastic every year. Plastic ingestion reduces the storage volume of the stomach, causing birds to consume less food and ultimately starve. Nearly all Laysan albatross chicks — 97.5 percent — have plastic pieces in their stomachs; their parents feed them plastic particles mistaken for food. Based on the amount of plastic found in seabird stomachs, the amount of garbage in our oceans has rapidly increased in the past 40 years. Marine mammals ingest and get tangled in plastic. Large amounts of plastic debris have been found in the habitat of endangered Hawaiian monk seals, including in areas that serve as pup nurseries. Entanglement deaths are severely undermining recovery efforts of this seal, which is already on the brink of extinction. Entanglement in plastic debris has also led to injury and mortality in the endangered Steller sea lion, with packing bands the most common entangling material. In 2008 two sperm whales were found stranded along the California coast with large amounts of fishing net scraps, rope and other plastic debris in their stomachs.

Pollution, alien species, and global warming are all alt. causes to marine biodiversity – empirically proven

**Imtiyaz, research fellow @ Indian Zoological Survey, 11 [Belim, 11/21/11, “Threats to Marine Biodiversity”, Narendra Publishing, [http://www.academia.edu/3424137/Threats\\_to\\_Marine\\_Biodiversity](http://www.academia.edu/3424137/Threats_to_Marine_Biodiversity), accessed 7/5/14]**

Understanding marine biodiversity and its threats are very important for a number of reasons. One¶ could argue that marine biodiversity has innate importance, as life has value on its own.¶ Anthropogenic impact on the oceans is already there to a considerable degree, especially in the¶ coastal areas but increasingly in the open ocean as well. Some threats are: Pollution, Habitat¶ Destruction (loss), Introduction of alien species, Overexploitation, Climate change and Declining¶ marine biodiversity worldwide is a major and on going environmental dilemma. Attention to¶ biodiversity changes in the oceans is limited and these threats are due to development related¶ activities along almost half of the world’s coasts. The impact of unsustainable developmental¶ activity has caused loss of habitat and massive reductions in our aquatic species biodiversity.¶ Pollution affects many marine organisms. Alien species can dramatically change the structure and¶ function of marine ecosystems by changing biodiversity and eliminating vital components of ¶ the food chain which are harmful to our native species. Increment in CO¶ 2¶ results in the decrease¶ of pH of the ocean, due to which acidification causes destruction of corals and coral reefs.¶ ¶ Keywords:¶ Pollution, Climate change, Alien species, Destruction, Overexploitation.¶ INTRODUCTION¶ ¶ For centuries the ocean was viewed as a boundless reservoir of productivity with unlimited¶ capacity to assimilate wastes. A productive

ecosystem is characterized by a high degree of biological diversity. In other words it contains a large assemblage of plant and animal species and each species has a well defined role to play. A high level species diversity in an ecosystem therefore guarantees stability because many species provide numerous pathways for energy of a system to flow. The Marine biodiversity of the ocean makes it one of the greatest resources for the human species. However, like all resources it must be used with caution so as to remain sustainable. Any decrease in marine biodiversity will have the greatest impact on developing countries risking their primary source of protein food. The resources of the sea have been over-harvested by humans thereby threatening marine biodiversity.

### 3 THREATS

Human activities are causing species to disappear at an alarming rate. It has been estimated that between 1975 and 2015, species extinction will occur at a rate of 1 to 11 % per decade. Losses of this magnitude impact the entire ecosystem, depriving valuable resources used to provide food, medicines, and industrial materials to human beings. There are some differences regarding the severity of each threat. Overfishing is the greatest threat to marine environments, other threats to aquatic biodiversity include urban development and resource-based industries, such as mining, dredging that destroy or reduce natural habitats. Air and water pollution, sedimentation, and climate change also pose threats to aquatic biodiversity. Many species of fishes, sea turtle and other marine animals are killed and discarded by-catch. The composition and structure of the fauna, flora and habitats of coastal seas has been changing at an unusual rate in the last few decades, due to changes in the global climate, invasive species and due to increase in human activities. However, humans do impact the oceans already to a considerable degree, especially in the coastal areas but increasingly in the open ocean as well. At present eutrophication is a primarily a problem of coastal water, particularly in shallow, particularly in enclosed area. These threats are:

- Introduction of alien species
- Climate change
- Pollution
- Habitat Destruction
- Over-exploitation

### INTRODUCTION OF ALIEN SPECIES

The introduction of harmful aquatic organisms to new marine environments is believed to be one of the four greatest threats to the world's oceans. An alien species is one that has been intentionally or accidentally transported and released into an environment outside of its historic geographical range. Such species are described as 'invasive' if they are ecologically and/or economically harmful. Invasive species can dramatically change the structure and function of marine ecosystems by changing biodiversity and eliminating vital components of the food chain. These species are harmful to native biodiversity in a number of ways, for example, as competitors, predators, parasites, or by spreading disease. Ships use water as ballast to adjust their position in the water to improve their maneuverability and stability. Mariners typically pump water into ballast tanks at one port and discharge it when taking on cargo at another port. Mariners have unintentionally transplanted locally native marine species to new areas with the ballast water. The arrival of an invasive jellyfish-like organism, *Mnemiopsis leidyi*, led to a major ecological "regime change" in the Black Sea, which contributed to the collapse of commercial fisheries in the region. Many other species have been introduced as planktonic larvae in ballast water. There are many alien species: Many seaweeds like red alga (*Kappaphycus striatum*), zebra mussel (*Dreissena polymorpha*), lion fish (Aquarium fish), *Caulerpa taxifolia*.

### POLLUTION

"Pollutants in the air, water, and soil can affect organisms in many different ways, from altering the rate of plant growth to changing reproduction patterns, in certain extreme situations, leading to extinction." Coral reefs can be damaged by a variety of pollutants that are produced by a variety of sources. Because algae can potentially grow so much faster than coral, they can out-compete corals. Human sewage, often untreated, can add nutrients, microorganisms, and other pollutants to coral reefs (depletion). Nutrients in sewage can cause eutrophication. Industrial wastes enter the sea as a result of deliberate dumping in specified location. These could be highly toxic, acidic or alkaline in the form of solid, liquid, inert substances. Mass mortality of fish or other marine organism has been reported from different regions caused by the release by industrial wastes. Earlier, both sewage and industrial wastes used to be dumped right along the shoreline. Now these are released through pipelines, either exposed or underground, some distance away where circulation of water is faster so that these are carried farther in to deeper water. Of all heavy metals,

those which cause concern are mercury, cadmium, lead and arsenic. These occur at extremely low concentration in the waters of the open ocean but tend to increase as we come to coastal waters because of industrial material discharged into the sea. Sources of oil pollution are normally, tanker disaster, ballast water and bilge washings, factories etc. Animals can be poisoned or suffer internal damage from ingesting oil so marine animals may become "sleepy" and drown. One of the most prevalent side effects of an oil spill is hypothermia. This is an illness often endured by marine creatures which have been exposed to it. Once the oil drifts into the water, it creates a sticky substance called the 'mousse'. This mousse gets stuck simply to the fur or feather of sea animals. The fur and feathers that are typically constructed up of air space to aid insulation are unable to fly and die due to starvation. Oil spills affect marine life like filter feeders by concentrating in the flesh of these animals. Clams, mussels, and oysters may quickly accumulate toxins which can kill the animals or be passed on along the food chain. Human consumers often complain that shellfish harvested from an area impacted by an oil spill taste heavy and oily. Animals that rely on these filter feeders for food may become sick and die as a result of consuming them. Oil spill can be especially harmful if they occur during coral spawning because the oil can kill eggs and sperm.

**OVER EXPLOITATION** Overexploitation can lead to resource depletion and put a number of threatened and endangered species at risk for extinction. A greater variety of species at a higher trophic level is exploited in the sea than on land: humans exploit over 400 species as food resources from the marine environment. The exponential growth of human population experienced in last decades has led to an overexploitation of marine living resources to meet growing demand for food. Worldwide, fishing fleets are two to three times as large as needed to take present day catches of fish and other marine species. The use of modern techniques to facilitate harvesting, transport and storage has accelerated the overexploitation. Thus a total of almost 80% of the world's fisheries are fully to overexploited, depleted, or in a state of collapse. Recently, a study showed that 29% of fish and seafood species have collapsed (i.e. their catch has declined by 90%) and are projected to collapse within by 2048, unless immediate action is taken. Worldwide about 90% of the stocks of large predatory fish stocks are already collapsed. Target species are generally the most impacted by overexploitation. Overfishing is far the biggest threat for the species listed as endangered or vulnerable to extinction. Overfishing is threatening many other species, particularly large sized fishes such as tunas, swordfish, and sharks.

**CLIMATE CHANGE** Global warming will cause sea level rise. As a result higher temperature decreases the ability of water to dissolve oxygen. Humans, however, have been increasing the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere by burning enormous amount of fossil fuels. Loggerhead Turtle nests in Florida have already producing 90% females owing to high temperatures, and if warming raises temperatures by an additional 1° C or more, no males will be produced there. Coral reefs require particular environmental conditions for growth and water temperatures from 23–29 °C are optimal for growth. Increasing temperature too much can cause the coral polyps to expel the zooxanthellae and lead to coral bleaching where the zooxanthellae are expelled from the coral by the polyps. Coastal power plants use seawater for cooling and discharge the warmed water at the coast. This locally disturbs the ecological balance of the marine communities; especially if it is already a low oxygen environment (gases are less soluble in warm water). Warming is bad for polar communities, the Arctic pack-ice has been getting thinner at a rate that if maintained will result in the Arctic becoming ice-free in a few decades, and with its disappearance will go polar bears, walrus and many of the other Arctic species.

**HABITAT DESTRUCTION** Loss of habitat is the major reason why aquatic biodiversity is declining. Habitat destruction and fragmentation is a process that describes the emergences of discontinuities (fragmentation) or the loss (destruction) of the environment inhabited by an organism. Approximately 20% of the world's coral reefs were lost and an additional 20% degraded in the last several decades of the twentieth century, and approximately 35% of mangrove area was lost during this time. When a species goes extinct, all the genetic information carried by individuals of that species is lost forever, never to be reproduced again. Extinction is a terrible waste of life and a loss of potential solutions to future problems such as possible cures to disease and solutions for survival in a changing world. Declining biodiversity worldwide is a major and ongoing environmental

dilemma. For ex: - Rising temperatures, rising sea levels, and other trends will have an effect on the world's 6 species of sea turtles. All over the world, divers catch the fish that live in and around coral reefs. But the divers want lots of fish and most of them are not very well trained at fish catching. Another way that divers catch coral reef fish is with cyanide a poison. The divers pour poison on the reef, which stuns the fish and kills the coral. This poison kills 90% of the fish that live in the reef and the reef is completely destroyed both by the poison and then by being ripped apart. Mangrove forests are routinely being cleared, with huge impacts on biodiversity. Healthy mangrove forests provide a critical habitat for many species in intertidal and estuarine areas and are key to a healthy marine environment. Elevated water temperatures cause bleaching and encourage disease. A combination of melting ice caps and thermal expansion of water in the oceans means that many low lying island states will be submerged. Many coastal areas and estuaries will be flooded by the sea, while an increase in extreme weather patterns will increase erosion and flooding. It is possible that even the fundamental patterns of ocean circulation which largely govern the earth's climate will be changed, leading to widespread disruption of both ocean and terrestrial ecosystems.

**CONCLUSION**

Human attention rightly focuses on the decline of biodiversity on land, but this should not happen at the expense of the oceans attention to marine biodiversity is also urgently needed if a stable relationship between humans and the sea is needed. The oceans have no owner and no single nation or international organisation is liable for their health. As a consequence, the seas are under increasing pressure. Preserving marine biodiversity for the sake of knowledge itself is important. Biodiversity is declining very rapidly and efforts to stop the decline must be intensified. There needs to be more public support in order to conserve. By passing knowledge and appreciation of marine biodiversity to future generations can be a great concern.

## 2NC Humans Survive

### **Humans will survive—we can isolate ourselves from the environment**

**Powers 2002** [Lawrence, Professor of Natural Sciences, Oregon Institute of Technology, The Chronicle of Higher Education, August 9] WD

Mass extinctions appear to result from major climatic changes or catastrophes, such as asteroid impacts. As far as we know, none has resulted from the activities of a species, regardless of predatory voracity, pathogenicity, or any other interactive attribute. We are the first species with the potential to manipulate global climates and to destroy

habitats, perhaps even ecosystems -- therefore setting the stage for a sixth mass extinction.

According to Boulter, this event will be an inevitable consequence of a "self-organized Earth-life system." This Gaia-like proposal might account for many of the processes exhibited by biological evolution before man's technological intervention, but ... the rules are now dramatically different. ... Many species may vanish, ... but that doesn't guarantee, unfortunately, that we will be

among the missing. While other species go bang in the night, humanity will technologically

isolate itself further from the natural world and will rationalize the decrease in biodiversity in

the same manner as we have done so far. I fear, that like the fabled cockroaches of the atomic age,

we may be one of the last life-forms to succumb, long after the "vast tracts of beauty" that Boulter

mourns we will no longer behold vanish before our distant descendants' eyes.

## 2NC Environment Resilient

**The environment is resilient- it has withstood ridiculous amounts of destruction**

**Easterbrook 95** [Gregg, Distinguished Fellow, Fullbright Foundation, A Moment on Earth p. 25] WD

IN THE AFTERMATH OF EVENTS SUCH AS LOVE CANAL OR THE Exxon Valdez oil spill, every reference to the environment is prefaced with the adjective "fragile." "Fragile environment" has become a welded phrase of the modern lexicon, like "aging hippie" or "fugitive financier." But the notion of a fragile environment is profoundly wrong. Individual animals, plants, and people are distressingly fragile. **The environment** that contains them **is close to indestructible.** The living environment of **Earth has survived ice ages;** bombardments of **cosmic radiation** more deadly than atomic fallout; **solar radiation** more powerful than the worst-case projection for ozone depletion; **thousand-year periods of intense volcanism releasing global air pollution** far worse than that made by any factory; **reversals of the planet's magnetic poles; the rearrangement of continents;** transformation of plains into mountain ranges and of seas into plains; **fluctuations of ocean currents and the jet stream;** **300-foot vacillations in sea levels;** shortening and lengthening of the seasons caused by **shifts in the planetary axis; collisions of asteroids and comets** bearing far more force than man's nuclear arsenals; **and the years without summer that followed these impacts. Yet hearts beat on, and petals unfold still.** **Were the environment fragile it would have expired many eons before the advent of** the industrial affronts of **the dreaming ape. Human assaults on the environment, though mischievous, are pinpricks compared to forces of the magnitude nature is accustomed to resisting.**

**No impact to biodiversity loss**

**Sedjo**, Senior Fellow at Resources for the Future, A DC research organization that studies natural resources, **2K**

[Roger, Resources for the Future, *Conserving Nature's Biodiversity: insights from biology, ethics and economics*, eds. Van Kooten, Bulte and Sinclair, 2000, p. 114)

As a critical input into the existence of humans and of life on earth, biodiversity obviously has a very high value (at least to humans). But, as with other resource questions, including public goods, biodiversity is not an either/or question, but rather a question of "how much." Thus, we may argue as to how much biodiversity is desirable or is required for human life (threshold) and how much is desirable (insurance) and at what price, just as societies argue over the appropriate amount and cost of national defense. As discussed by Simpson, the value of water is small even though it is essential to human life, while diamonds are inessential but valuable to humans. The reason has to do with relative abundance and scarcity, with market value pertaining to the marginal unit. This water-diamond paradox can be applied to biodiversity. Although biological diversity is essential, a single species has only limited value, since the global system will continue to function without that species. Similarly, the value of a piece of biodiversity (e.g., 10 ha of tropical forest) is small to negligible since its contribution to the functioning of the global biodiversity is negligible. The global ecosystem can function with "somewhat more" or "somewhat less" biodiversity, since there have been larger amounts in times past and some losses in recent times. Therefore, in the absence of evidence to indicate that small habitat losses threaten the functioning of the global life support system, the value of these marginal habitats is negligible. The "value question" is that of how valuable to the life support function are species at the margin. While this, in principle, is an empirical question, in practice it is probably unknowable. However, thus far, biodiversity losses appear to have had little or no effect on the functioning of the earth's life

support system, presumably due to the resiliency of the system, which perhaps is due to the redundancy found in the system. Through most of its existence, earth has had far less biological diversity. Thus, as in the water-diamond paradox, the value of the marginal unit of biodiversity appears to be very small.



## **2NC Exaggeration**

**Environmental groups exaggerate extinction rate.**

**Entropy Magazines, 2**

[“Reviews”, <http://entropy.brni-jhu.org/reviews/skeptical.html>, November, December 2002]

Similarly, Greenpeace claimed that 50% of Earth's biodiversity will be lost in 75 years, when the actual number of species lost predicted by reputable sources is 0.7% over 50 years - still too high, but indicating a 47- fold exaggeration by Greenpeace. The statistic commonly cited by environmentalists of 40,000 species disappearing each year was simply picked out of a hat. This number is 10,000 times higher than the rate observed by biologists. The author gives numerous other examples of false and exaggerated statements by Greenpeace, the Worldwide Fund for Nature, World Watch Institute, and other environmental activist groups.

**Environmental groups exaggerate the crisis**

**Dartmouth Review, 2**

[“Inside the Environmentalist Echo Chamber, April 2002,  
<http://www.dartreview.com/archives/000059.php> ]

The major environmental organizations have both economic and political reasons to exaggerate the extent of our environmental problems and avoid dispassionate analysis of the costs and benefits of the solutions they propose. Their fundraising depends on maintaining the perception among their membership that the environment is under siege. To admit that an environmental issue is complex and not well understood, and that a proposed solution could on balance have a negative impact, does not make for a very effective call to arms. Major environmental legislation gets passed only if a sense of crisis is created.

## **2NC Biodiversity Bad**

### **Turn – biodiversity causes instability – scientific consensus**

**Naeem et al.**, Director of Science at Center for Environmental Research and Conservation, Professor and Chair of Columbia University Department of Ecology, **2**

[Shahid, Department of Ecology, Evolution and Environmental Biology, “Biodiversity and ecosystem functioning: synthesis and perspectives,” pg. 80]\

The early view that permeated ecology until the 1960s was that diversity (or complexity) begets stability. This view was formalized and theorized by people such as Odum (1953), MacArthur (1955) and Elton (1958) in the 1950s. Odum (1953) and Elton (1958) observed that simple communities are more easily upset than rich ones, i.e. they are more subject to destructive population oscillations and invasions. MacArthur (1955) proposed, using a heuristic model that the more pathways there are for energy to reach a consumer, the less severe is the failure of any one pathway. These conclusions were based on either intuitive arguments or loose observations, but lacked a strong theoretical and experimental foundation. Probably because they represented the conventional wisdom (‘don’t put all your eggs in one basket’) and the prevailing philosophical view of the ‘balance of nature’, they became almost universally accepted. This ‘conventional wisdom’ was seriously challenged in the early 1970s by theorists such as Levins (1970), Gardner and Ashby (1970), and May (1972, 1974), who borrowed the formalism of deterministic autonomous dynamical systems from Newtonian physics and showed that, in these model systems, the more complex the system, the less likely it is to be stable. Stability here was defined qualitatively by the fact that system returns to its equilibrium or steady state after a perturbation. This intuitive explanation for this destabilizing influence of complexity is that the more diversified and the more connected a system, the more numerous and the longer the pathways along which a perturbation can propagate within the system, leading to either its collapse or its explosion. This conclusion was further supported by analyses of one quantitative measure of stability, resilience (Table 7.1), in model food webs (Pimm and Lawton 1977; Pimm 1982). This theoretical work had a number of limitations. In particular, it was based on randomly constructed model communities. More realistic food webs incorporating thermodynamic constraints and observed patterns of interaction strengths do not necessarily have the same properties (DeAngelis 1975; de Ruiter et al. 1990). Also, there have been few direct experimental tests of the theory, and many of the natural patterns that agree with theoretical predictions can be explained by more parsimonious hypotheses such as the trophic cascade model (Cohen and Newman 1985). Despite these limitations, the view that diversity and complexity beget instability, not stability, quickly became the new paradigm in the 1970s and 1980s because of the mathematical rigour of the theory.

## **2NC No Extinction**

### **New species balance loss of species – studies prove**

**Biello 14** (David, Environmental Journalist, 4-20-14, "Biodiversity Survives Extinctions for Now," Scientific American, <http://www.scientificamerican.com/podcast/episode/biodiversity-survives-extinctions-for-now1/>, accessed 7-5-14)

We are living during what seem to be the opening stages of the sixth mass extinction in our planet's 4.5 billion year history. Species of birds, fish, mammals and plants are disappearing at speeds rarely experienced, thanks in large part to human activities: pollution, climate change, habitat destruction and other damage. But extinction apparently does not mean less biodiversity—at least not yet.¶¶ A new look at ecosystems from the poles to the tropics shows that losses in the number of species in any given place do not yet translate to large changes in the overall number of different species there. The study is in the journal Science. [Maria Dornelas et al, Assemblage Time Series Reveal Biodiversity Change but Not Systematic Loss]¶¶ The researchers analyzed 100 surveys that followed more than 35,000 different species over various lengths of time. These long-term studies found that the number of different species in, say, a coral reef remains relatively constant. Because the loss of a species, either locally or entirely, is often balanced by the arrival of a new species.¶

### **99.9% biodiversity loss has no impact on humanity**

**Sagoff- Sr researcher, U Maryland - '97 (Mark, Senior Research Scholar @ Institute for Philosophy and Public policy in School of Public Affairs @ U. Maryland, William and Mary Law Review, "INSTITUTE OF BILL OF RIGHTS LAW SYMPOSIUM DEFINING TAKINGS: PRIVATE PROPERTY AND THE FUTURE OF GOVERNMENT REGULATION: MUDDLE OR MUDDLE THROUGH? TAKINGS JURISPRUDENCE MEETS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT", 38 Wm and Mary L. Rev. 825, March, L/N)**

Although one may agree with ecologists such as Ehrlich and Raven that the earth stands on the brink of an episode of massive extinction, it may not follow from this grim fact that human beings will suffer as a result. On the contrary, skeptics such as science writer Colin Tudge have challenged biologists to explain why we need more than a tenth of the 10 to 100 million species that grace the earth. Noting that "cultivated systems often out-produce wild systems by 100-fold or more," Tudge declared that "the argument that humans need the variety of other species is, when you think about it, a theological one." n343 Tudge observed that "the elimination of all but a tiny minority of our fellow creatures does not affect the material well-being of humans one iota." n344 This skeptic challenged ecologists to list more than 10,000 species (other than unthreatened microbes) that are essential to ecosystem productivity or functioning. n345 "The human species could survive just as well if 99.9% of our fellow creatures went extinct, provided only that we retained the appropriate 0.1% that we need." n346 [\*906] The monumental Global Biodiversity Assessment ("the Assessment") identified two positions with respect to redundancy of species. "At one extreme is the idea that each species is unique and important, such that its removal or loss will have demonstrable consequences to the functioning of the community or ecosystem." n347 The authors of the Assessment, a panel of eminent ecologists, endorsed this position, saying it is "unlikely that there is much, if any, ecological redundancy in communities over time scales of decades to centuries, the time period over which environmental policy should operate." n348 These

eminent ecologists rejected the opposing view, "the notion that species overlap in function to a sufficient degree that removal or loss of a species will be compensated by others, with negligible overall consequences to the community or ecosystem." n349 Other biologists believe, however, that species are so fabulously redundant in the ecological functions they perform that the life-support systems and processes of the planet and ecological processes in general will function perfectly well with fewer of them, certainly fewer than the millions and millions we can expect to remain even if every threatened organism becomes extinct. n350 Even the kind of sparse and miserable world depicted in the movie Blade Runner could provide a "sustainable" context for the human economy as long as people forgot their aesthetic and moral commitment to the glory and beauty of the natural world. n351 The Assessment makes this point. "Although any ecosystem contains hundreds to thousands of species interacting among themselves and their physical environment, the emerging consensus is that the system is driven by a small number of . . . biotic variables on whose interactions the balance of species are, in a sense, carried along." n352 [\*907] To make up your mind on the question of the functional redundancy of species, consider an endangered species of bird, plant, or insect and ask how the ecosystem would fare in its absence. The fact that the creature is endangered suggests an answer: it is already in limbo as far as ecosystem processes are concerned. What crucial ecological services does the black-capped vireo, for example, serve? Are any of the species threatened with extinction necessary to the provision of any ecosystem service on which humans depend? If so, which ones are they? Ecosystems and the species that compose them have changed, dramatically, continually, and totally in virtually every part of the United States. There is little ecological similarity, for example, between New England today and the land where the Pilgrims died. n353 In view of the constant reconfiguration of the biota, one may wonder why Americans have not suffered more as a result of ecological catastrophes. The cast of species in nearly every environment changes constantly-local extinction is commonplace in nature-but the crops still grow. Somehow, it seems, property values keep going up on Martha's Vineyard in spite of the tragic disappearance of the heath hen. One might argue that the sheer number and variety of creatures available to any ecosystem buffers that system against stress. Accordingly, we should be concerned if the "library" of creatures ready, willing, and able to colonize ecosystems gets too small. (Advances in genetic engineering may well permit us to write a large number of additions to that "library.") In the United States as in many other parts of the world, however, the number of species has been increasing dramatically, not decreasing, as a result of human activity. This is because the hordes of exotic species coming into ecosystems in the United States far exceed the number of species that are becoming extinct. Indeed, introductions may outnumber extinctions by more than ten to one, so that the United States is becoming more and more species-rich all the time largely as a result of human action. n354 [\*908] Peter Vitousek and colleagues estimate that over 1000 non-native plants grow in California alone; in Hawaii there are 861; in Florida, 1210. n355 In Florida more than 1000 non-native insects, 23 species of mammals, and about 11 exotic birds have established themselves. n356 Anyone who waters a lawn or hoes a garden knows how many weeds desire to grow there, how many birds and bugs visit the yard, and how many fungi, creepy-crawlies, and other odd life forms show forth when it rains. All belong to nature, from wherever they might hail, but not many homeowners would claim that there are too few of them. Now, not all exotic species provide ecosystem services; indeed, some may be disruptive or have no instrumental value. n357 This also may be true, of course, of native species as well, especially because all exotics are native somewhere. Certain exotic species, however, such as Kentucky blue grass, establish an area's sense of identity and place; others, such as the green crabs showing up around Martha's Vineyard, are nuisances. n358 Consider an analogy [\*909] with human

migration. Everyone knows that after a generation or two, immigrants to this country are hard to distinguish from everyone else. The vast majority of Americans did not evolve here, as it were, from hominids; most of us "came over" at one time or another. This is true of many of our fellow species as well, and they may fit in here just as well as we do. It is possible to distinguish exotic species from native ones for a period of time, just as we can distinguish immigrants from native-born Americans, but as the centuries roll by, species, like people, fit into the landscape or the society, changing and often enriching it. Shall we have a rule that a species had to come over on the Mayflower, as so many did, to count as "truly" American? Plainly not. When, then, is the cutoff date? Insofar as we are concerned with the absolute numbers of "rivets" holding ecosystems together, extinction seems not to pose a general problem because a far greater number of kinds of mammals, insects, fish, plants, and other creatures thrive on land and in water in America today than in prelapsarian times. n359 The Ecological Society of America has urged managers to maintain biological diversity as a critical component in strengthening ecosystems against disturbance. n360 Yet as Simon Levin observed, "much of the detail about species composition will be irrelevant in terms of influences on ecosystem properties." n361 [\*910] He added: "For net primary productivity, as is likely to be the case for any system property, biodiversity matters only up to a point; above a certain level, increasing biodiversity is likely to make little difference." n362 What about the use of plants and animals in agriculture? There is no scarcity foreseeable. "Of an estimated 80,000 types of plants [we] know to be edible," a U.S. Department of the Interior document says, "only about 150 are extensively cultivated." n363 About twenty species, not one of which is endangered, provide ninety percent of the food the world takes from plants. n364 Any new food has to take "shelf space" or "market share" from one that is now produced. Corporations also find it difficult to create demand for a new product; for example, people are not inclined to eat paw-paws, even though they are delicious. It is hard enough to get people to eat their broccoli and lima beans. It is harder still to develop consumer demand for new foods. This may be the reason the Kraft Corporation does not prospect in remote places for rare and unusual plants and animals to add to the world's diet.

## **Species extinction won't cause human extinction – humans and the environment are adaptable**

**Doremus' oo**

**(Holly, Professor of Law at UC Davis Washington & Lee Law Review, Winter 57 Wash & Lee L. Rev. 11, lexis)**

In recent years, this discourse frequently has taken the form of the ecological horror story. That too is no mystery. The ecological horror story is unquestionably an attention-getter, especially in the hands of skilled writers [\*46] like Carson and the Ehrlichs. The image of the airplane earth, its wings wobbling as rivet after rivet is carelessly popped out, is difficult to ignore. The apocalyptic depiction of an impending crisis of potentially dire proportions is designed to spur the political community to quick action. Furthermore, this story suggests a goal that appeals to many nature lovers: that virtually everything must be protected. To reinforce this suggestion, tellers of the ecological horror story often imply that the relative importance of various rivets to the ecological plane cannot be determined. They offer reams of data and dozens of anecdotes demonstrating the unexpected value of apparently useless parts of nature. The moth that saved Australia from prickly pear invasion, the scrubby Pacific yew, and the

downright unattractive leech are among the uncharismatic flora and fauna who star in these anecdotes. n211 The moral is obvious: because we cannot be sure which rivets are holding the plane together, saving them all is the only sensible course. Notwithstanding its attractions, the material discourse in general, and the ecological horror story in particular, are not likely to generate policies that will satisfy nature lovers. The ecological horror story implies that there is no reason to protect nature until catastrophe looms. The Ehrlichs' rivet-popper account, for example, presents species simply as the (fungible) hardware holding together the ecosystem. If we could be reasonably certain that a particular rivet was not needed to prevent a crash, the rivet-popper story suggests that we would lose very little by pulling it out. Many environmentalists, though, would disagree. Reluctant to concede such losses, tellers of the ecological horror story highlight how close a catastrophe might be, and how little we know about what actions might trigger one. But the apocalyptic vision is less credible today than it seemed in the 1970s. Although it is clear that the earth is experiencing a mass wave of extinctions, the complete elimination of life on earth seems unlikely. Life is remarkably robust. Nor is human extinction probable any time soon. Homo sapiens is adaptable to nearly any environment. Even if the world of the future includes far fewer species, it likely will hold people. One response to this credibility problem tones the story down a bit, arguing not that humans will go extinct but that ecological disruption will bring economies, and consequently civilizations, to their knees. But this too may be overstating the case. Most ecosystem functions are performed by multiple species. This functional redundancy means that a high proportion of species can be lost without precipitating a collapse.

### **Biodiversity is resilient- 95% loss of species leaves 80% of diversity**

#### **DALLAS MORNING NEWS 10-27-1997**

Even though populations are disappearing quickly, Hughes said that the second "Science" paper is "a bright spot in all this," describing how the tree of life could survive serious pruning. Even if 95 percent of all species are lost, 80 percent of the underlying evolutionary history remains intact, write Nee and Sir Robert May, also a biologist at Oxford. The scientists came up with equations to describe how much evolutionary history would remain after some species went extinct. And they found that it didn't really matter whether they killed off species at random or in a particular pattern. Choosing particular species to save didn't preserve much more evolutionary history than saving species at random, the research shows. The work has implications for conservation biologists, who struggle with choosing which species are the most important to protect. "It turns out that it really doesn't make a whole lot of difference," Dr. Nee said.

### **Biodiversity isn't key to ecosystems – scientific consensus agrees**

#### **Calgary Herald, August 30, 1997**

Ecologists have long maintained that diversity is one of nature's greatest strengths, but new research suggests that diversity alone does not guarantee strong ecosystems. In findings that could intensify the debate over endangered species and habitat conservation, three new studies suggest a greater abundance of plant and animal varieties doesn't always translate to better ecological health. At least equally important, the research found, are the types of species and how they function together. "Having

a long list of Latin names isn't always better than a shorter list of Latin names," said Stanford University biologist Peter Vitousek, co-author of one of the studies published in the journal Science. Separate experiments in California, Minnesota and Sweden, found that diversity often had little bearing on the performance of ecosystems -- at least as measured by the growth and health of native plants. In fact, the communities with the greatest biological richness were often the poorest when it came to productivity and the cycling of nutrients. One study compared plant life on 50 remote islands in northern Sweden that are prone to frequent wildfires from lightning strikes. Scientist David Wardle of Landcare Research in Lincoln, New Zealand, and colleagues at the Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, found that islands dominated by a few species of plants recovered more quickly than nearby islands with greater biological diversity. Similar findings were reported by University of Minnesota researchers who studied savannah grasses, and by Stanford's Vitousek and colleague David Hooper, who concluded that functional characteristics of plant species were more important than the number of varieties in determining how ecosystems performed. British plant ecologist J.P. Grime, in a commentary summarizing the research, said there is as yet no "convincing evidence that species diversity and ecosystem function are consistently and causally related." "It could be argued," he added, "that the tide is turning against the notion of high biodiversity as a controller of ecosystem function and insurance against ecological collapse."

### **Multiple alt causes to biod loss**

**Daily Star 2/15/o8 (pg. <http://www.thedailystar.net/story.php?nid=23395>)**

Biodiversity is disappearing from the natural ecosystems of forests, savannahs, pastures and rangelands, deserts, tundras, rivers, lakes and seas .This is largely the result of human activity and represents a serious threat to human development. To protect these precious resources for human kind various environmental conservation organisations are working world-wide.

### **Timeframe is decades away**

**Hindu 1/19/o8 (pg.**

**<http://www.hindu.com/2008/01/19/stories/2008011956800500.htm>)**

Biodiversity is being lost more rapidly now than at any time in the past several million years, said S. Kannaiyan, chairman, National Biodiversity Authority of India here on Friday. Inaugurating a three-day conference on 'Biodiversity, Bio-resources and Biotechnology for Sustainable Livelihood of Rural Community', Dr. Kannaiyan said biologists believed that about 60,000 of the world's 2.40 lakh plant species and more vertebrates and insect species could become extinct within the next 30 years if the same trend continued. The current rate of extinction demanded immediate concerted efforts for conservation of biodiversity for future generations, he said. It had been recognised that valuable and productive biological resources were crucial for sustainable economic development, he said.

**China is key to biodiversity and it will decrease now**

**Asia Times 9/20/07 (pg.**

**[http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China\\_Business/II20Cb02.html](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/China_Business/II20Cb02.html)**)

China may be going all out to save the panda, but its record on protecting its native flora and fauna took a beating last week when the World Conservation Union (IUCN, or International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources) published its latest Red List of Threatened Species. China has one of the highest levels of biodiversity in the world, yet its number of species is declining at a frightening rate. The Swiss-based IUCN picked out mainland China, along with Mexico, Brazil



## **2NC De-Extinction**

**Biodiversity loss is reversible - new technologies allow us to have de-extinction so scientists can bring animals who are extinct back**

**Shreeve 13** (Jamie Shreeve, Executive Editor for Science at National Geographic 3-5-2013, "Species Revival: Should We Bring Back Extinct Animals?" National Geographic, <http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2013/03/130305-science-animals-extinct-species-revival-deextinction-debate-tedx/>, accessed 7-5-14)

Or at least it has been, until now. For the first time, our own species—the one that has done so much to condemn those other 795 to oblivion—may be poised to bring at least some of them back. (Interactive map: Get a close look at 20 endangered species in the U.S.)¶ The Question of De-extinction¶ The gathering awareness that we have arrived at this threshold prompted a group of scientists and conservationists to meet at National Geographic headquarters in Washington, D.C., last year to discuss the viability of the science and the maturity of the ethical argument surrounding what has come to be known as de-extinction. Next week an expanded group will reconvene at National Geographic headquarters in a public TEDx conference.¶ People were fantasizing about reviving extinct forms of life long before Hollywood embedded the idea into our collective consciousness with Jurassic Park. Can we really do it? And if we can, why should we?¶ The first question would seem to have a straightforward, if hardly simple, answer. Scientific developments—principally advances in cloning technologies and new methods of not only reading DNA, but writing it—make it much easier to concoct a genetic approximation of an extinct species, so long as DNA can be retrieved from a preserved specimen.

**Science solves biodiversity loss – new tech allows us to bring extinct animals back**

**Brand 13** (Stewart Brand, Science writer for National Geographic, Co-founder of the long now science foundation and the creator of the whole earth catalog, 3-11-13, "Opinion: The Case for Reviving Extinct Species," National Geographic, [http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2013/03/130311-deextinction-reviving-extinct-species-opinion-animals-science/?rptregcta=reg\\_free\\_np&rptregcampaign=20140623\\_t2\\_rw\\_membership\\_r1p\\_us\\_se\\_w](http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2013/03/130311-deextinction-reviving-extinct-species-opinion-animals-science/?rptregcta=reg_free_np&rptregcampaign=20140623_t2_rw_membership_r1p_us_se_w), accessed 7-5-14)

¶ Many extinct species—from the passenger pigeon to the woolly mammoth—might now be reclassified as "bodily, but not genetically, extinct." They're dead, but their DNA is recoverable from museum specimens and fossils, even those up to 200,000 years old.¶ Thanks to new developments in genetic technology, that DNA may eventually bring the animals back to life. Only species whose DNA is too old to be recovered, such as dinosaurs, are the ones to consider totally extinct, bodily and genetically.¶ But why bring vanished creatures back to life? It will be expensive and difficult. It will take decades. It won't always succeed. Why even try? Why do we take enormous trouble to protect endangered species? The same reasons will apply to species brought back from extinction: to preserve biodiversity, to restore diminished ecosystems, to advance the science of preventing extinctions, and to undo harm that humans have caused in the past.¶ Furthermore, the prospect of de-extinction is

profound news. That something as irreversible and final as extinction might be reversed is a stunning realization. The imagination soars. Just the thought of mammoths and passenger pigeons alive again invokes the awe and wonder that drives all conservation at its deepest level.¶¶ Then, there's the power of good news. The International Union for Conservation of Nature is adding to its famous "Red List" of endangered species a pair of "Green Lists."¶¶ One will describe species that are doing fine as well as species that were in trouble and are now doing better, thanks to effective efforts to help them. The other list will describe protected wild lands in the world that are particularly well managed.¶¶ Conservationists are learning the benefits of building hope and building on hope. Species brought back from extinction will be beacons of hope. (Pictures: Extinct Species that Could be Brought Back.)¶¶ Useful science will also emerge. Close examination of the genomes of extinct species can tell us much about what made them vulnerable in the first place. Were they in a bottleneck with too little genetic variability? How were they different from close relatives that survived? Living specimens will reveal even more.¶¶ Techniques being developed for de-extinction will also be directly applicable to living species that are close to extinction. Tiny populations can have their genetic variability restored. A species with a genetic Achilles' heel might be totally cured with an adjustment introduced through cloning.¶¶ For instance, the transmissible cancer on the faces of Tasmanian devils is thought to be caused by a single gene. That gene can be silenced in a generation of the animals released to the wild. The cancer would disappear in the wild soon after, because the immune animals won't transmit it, and animals with the immunity will out-reproduce the susceptible until the entire population is immune.¶¶ ¶¶ ¶¶ Some extinct species were important "keystones" in their region. Restoring them would help restore a great deal of ecological richness.

## **Environmental Leadership Core**

## 1NC Environmental Leadership Frontline

**There is no correlation between environmental leadership and hegemony-military dominance trades off with environmental issues.**

**Falkner '5 [11-18-14, Robert Falkner is a member of the Department of International Relations at the London School of Economics, "American Hegemony and the Global Environment,"** <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-2486.2005.00534.x/full#>, **HR]**

At a conceptual level, structural accounts emphasizing the role of hegemons have been criticized for providing only a partial explanation of international cooperation at best or for ignoring the issue-specific characteristics of international environmental politics. Young (1994) has argued that **the question of transferability or substitutability of different forms of power limits the applicability of hegemonic theory in the field of environmental protection. The United States may be the unrivaled military superpower at the beginning of the twenty-first century, but "there is little reason to believe that military power has much relevance in the negotiations of ... environmental regimes"** (Young 1994:136). In a similar vein, Gareth Porter and Janet Welsh Brown (1996:15) state: **Global environmental politics do not give rise to a hegemonic power in the traditional sense of a state with the ability to use military power to coerce other states into accepting the hegemon's position. There is no positive correlation between dominant military power and leadership on global environmental issues—and there may be a negative correlation** between the two in that high levels of **military spending divert financial resources from environmental issues.**

**Other countries fill-in—hegemony is not necessary to prevent war.**

**Preble and Friedman 10** — Christopher Preble, Director of Foreign Policy Studies at the Cato Institute, served as a commissioned officer in the U.S. Navy, holds a Ph.D. in History from Temple University, and Benjamin H. Friedman, Research Fellow in Defense and Homeland Security Studies at the Cato Institute, Ph.D. Candidate in Political Science at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2010 ("A U.S. Defense Budget Worthy of Its Name," *The Globalist*, November 18<sup>th</sup>, Available Online at [http://www.cato.org/pub\\_display.php?pub\\_id=12582](http://www.cato.org/pub_display.php?pub_id=12582), Accessed 01-07-2011)

**An other argument for high military spending is that U.S. military primacy underlies global stability.** According to this theory, our forces and alliance commitments dampen conflict between potential rivals, preventing them from fighting wars that would disrupt trade. This logic liberates defense planning from old-fashioned considerations like enemies and the balance of power. It sees the requirements of global policing as the basis for the size of the U.S. military. That is no standard at all, which is why hawks embrace it. Boundless objectives justify limitless costs. **That argument overestimates both the American military's contribution to international stability and the danger that instability abroad poses to Americans. U.S. force deployments in Europe and Asia now contribute little to peace, at best making already low odds of war among states slightly lower.** Inertia, rather than our security requirements, explains the perseverance of U.S. military alliances. During the Cold War, Japan, Western Europe and South Korea grew wealthy enough to defend themselves. We should let them do so. These alliances heighten our force requirements and threaten to drag us into wars, while providing no obvious benefit. **Without our forces there, our allies would pay the cost of balancing local adversaries.**

**Numerous domestic factors make hegemony unsustainable—education, infrastructure, health care, income inequality, poverty, and political gridlock are the foundation of American power**

**Cohen 12**—Michael A. Cohen is a regular columnist for Foreign Policy and a fellow at the Century Foundation. ("Rotting From the Inside Out," Published Online for *Foreign Policy* on February 24, 2012, Available Online at [http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting\\_from\\_the\\_inside\\_out](http://www.foreignpolicy.com/articles/2012/02/21/rotting_from_the_inside_out))

There is, however, one serious problem with this analysis. Any discussion of American national security that focuses solely on the issue of U.S. power vis-à-vis other countries -- and ignores domestic inputs -- is decidedly incomplete. In Kagan's New Republic article, for example, he has little to say about the country's domestic challenges except to obliquely argue that to focus on "nation-building" at home while ignoring the importance of maintaining U.S. power abroad would be a mistake. In fact, in a recent FP debate with the Financial Times' Gideon Rachman on the issue of American decline, Kagan diagnoses what he, and many other political analysts, appear to believe is the country's most serious problem: "enormous fiscal deficits driven by entitlements." Why is this bad? It makes it harder, says Kagan, for the United States to "continue playing its vital role in the world" and will lead to significant cutbacks in defense spending. However, a focus on U.S. global dominance or suasion that doesn't factor in those elements that constitute American power at home ignores substantial and worsening signs of decline. Indeed, by virtually any measure, a closer look at the state of the United States today tells a sobering tale of rapid and unchecked decay and deterioration in a host of areas. While not all of them are generally considered elements of national security, perhaps they should be. Let's start with education, which almost any observer would agree is a key factor in national competitiveness. The data is not good. According to the most recent OECD report on global education standards, the United States is an average country in how it educates its children -- 12th in reading skills, 17th in science, and 26th in math. The World Economic Forum ranks the United States 48th in the quality of its mathematics and science education, even though we spend more money per student than almost any country in the world. America's high school graduation rate is lower today than it was in the late 1960s and "kids are now less likely to graduate from high school than their parents," according to an analysis released last year by the Editorial Projects in Education Research Center. In fact, not only is the graduation rate worse than many Western countries, the United States is now the only developed country where a higher percentage of 55 to 64-year-olds have a high school diploma than 25 to 34-year-olds. While the United States still maintains the world's finest university system, college graduation rates are slipping. Among 25 to 34-year-olds, America trails Australia, Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Ireland, Israel, Japan, South Korea, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Sweden, and the United Kingdom in its percentage of college graduates. This speaks, in some measure, to the disparities that are endemic in the U.S. education system. If you are poor in America, chances are you attend a school that underperforms, are taught by teachers that are not as effective, and have test scores that lag far behind your more affluent counterparts (the same is true if you are black or Hispanic -- you lag behind your white counterparts). Can a country be a great global power if its education system is fundamentally unequal and is getting steadily worse? What about national infrastructure -- another key element of national economic power and global competitiveness? First, the nation's broadband penetration rates remain in the middle of the global pack and there is growing divide in the United States between digital haves and have nots. Overall, its transportation networks are mediocre compared to similarly wealthy countries and according to the World Economic Forum, the United States ranks 23rd in the OECD for infrastructure quality -- a ranking that has steadily declined over the past decade. American commuters spend more time in traffic than Western Europeans, the country's train system and high-speed rail lines in general pale next to that of other developed nations, and even the number of people killed on American highways is 60 percent higher than the OECD average. Part of the problem is that the amount of money the U.S. government spends on infrastructure has steadily declined for decades and now trails far behind other Western nations. In time, such infrastructure disadvantages have the potential to undermine the U.S. economy, hamstringing productivity and competitiveness, and put the lives of more Americans at risk -- and this appears to be happening already. Finally, a closer look at the U.S. health care system is enough to make one ill. Even after the passage of Obama's 2010 health care reform bill (which every Republican presidential candidate wants to repeal) the United States is far from having a

health care system that meets the needs of its citizens. According to a July 2011 report by the Commonwealth Fund, "the U.S. has fewer hospital beds and physicians, and sees fewer hospital and physician visits, than in most other countries" even though it spends far more on health care per capita than any other country in the world. In addition, "prescription drug utilization, prices, and spending all appear to be highest in the U.S., as does the supply, utilization, and price of diagnostic imaging." Long story short, the United States spends more for less on health care than pretty much any other developed nation in the world. That might also explain why life expectancy in America trails far behind most OECD countries. The United States also has the unique distinction of having one of the highest rates of income inequality in the world, on par with such global powerhouses as Cameroon, Madagascar, Rwanda, Uganda, and Ecuador. It has the fourth worst child poverty rate and trails only Mexico and Turkey in overall poverty rate among OECD countries. And when it comes to infant mortality, the U.S. rate is one of the worst in the developing world. But not to fear, the United States still maintains some advantages. For example, it is one of the fattest countries in the world, with approximately one-third of the country considered obese (including one out of every six children). In addition, the United States has, by far, the largest prison population -- more than China, Iran, and Cuba -- one of the highest homicide rates in the world, and one of the highest rates of death from child abuse and neglect. This steady stream of woe is certainly dispiriting, but the more optimistic might be inclined to respond that America had had problems before and has always found a way to right the ship. Certainly, this is a legitimate counter-point. The problem is that anyone looking to Washington today would have a hard time imagining that Congress and the White House will lock arms anytime soon and fix these various national crises. And this political gridlock is the biggest reason to be concerned about decline. Perhaps at no point in recent American history has the country's politics been less capable of dealing with serious challenges. Certainly, when one party basically rejects any role for the federal government in providing health care, improving educational opportunity, or strengthening the social safety net, the chances for compromise appear even slimmer. As Harold Pollack, a professor at the University of Chicago, said to me, "What future president, witnessing Barack Obama's difficulties over health reform, will make an equivalent political investment regarding climate change or another great national concern? I fear that we are headed for a kind of legislative Vietnam syndrome in which our leaders will shy away from the large things that must be done." Obama argued in his recent State of the Union speech that "innovation is what America has always been about." Indeed, the recent report of the Information Technology and Innovation Foundation found that the United States is currently sixth in global innovation and competitiveness. Good news, right? Not so fast. The report also found that the country is dead last in "improvement in international competitiveness and innovation capacity over the last decade." Bottom line: dysfunction reaps an ill reward. Kagan's retort to this argument is that "on many big issues throughout their history, Americans have found a way of achieving and implementing a national consensus." True, but the philosophical divide between the two parties over the role of government offers little reason for optimism that such a new national consensus is in the offing. The fact is, discussions of U.S. power that only take into account America's global standing in relation to other countries are not only misleading -- they're largely irrelevant. Sure, America has a bigger and better military than practically every other nation combined. Sure, it has a better global image than Russia or China or any other potential global rival. Sure, America's economy is bigger than any other nation's (though this is a debatable point). But if its students aren't being well educated, if huge disparities exist in technological adoption, if social mobility remains stagnant, if the country's health care system is poorly functioning, and if its government is hopelessly gridlocked, what good is all the global power that transfixes Kagan and others? The even more urgent question is how the United States can hope to maintain that power if it's built on a shaky foundation at home. Rather than talking about how great America is on the campaign trail -- which surely both candidates will do throughout the 2012 election -- the country would likely be better off having an honest discussion on the immense challenges that it faces at home. Even more helpful would be a recognition that education, health care, infrastructure, and overall national economic competitiveness is as essential to U.S. national security as, for example, the number of ships in the U.S. Navy. All this talk about the myth of American decline might make Americans feel better about themselves for a while, but it is a distraction from the real and declining elements of U.S. power.

## Ratifying environment treaties key to global environmental leadership- alt cause the aff can't solve

**Knox 12-** John Knox, Henry C. Lauerman Professor of International Law at Wake Forest University, advisor to the UN Human Rights Council, the World Bank, and the Government of the Maldives on the relationship between climate change and human rights law, 2012 ("Reclaiming Global Environmental Leadership," Center for Progressive Reform, January 20th, Available online at <http://www.progressivereform.org/CPRBlog.cfm?idBlog=FB9153F2-ABFE-3CF2-8053EAF1ED929DB8>, Accessed 7-1-14)

Ratifying these treaties wouldn't be onerous or expensive, and none of the agreements would require major changes to U.S. law or erode our sovereignty. In fact, the failure to ratify the agreements harms our national interests. The treaties reflect U.S. proposals and positions and are a product of negotiations and brokering by our past administrations. By failing to join the treaties, the United States is not taking advantage of the benefits for which it negotiated, including being able to make claims to the resource-rich continental shelf off the U.S. coast, reducing marine pollution affecting U.S. waters, and ensuring U.S. access to foreign plant gene banks. The failure to ratify the agreements also prevents the United States from fully participating in their ongoing interpretation and implementation, which often involve issues that directly affect the United States. The failure to join the treaties also undermines global environmental protection. Several of the environmental treaties are among the most widely ratified treaties in history, strongly supported by our closest allies. In every case, the regimes these treaties have established are less successful without U.S. membership than they could be with the full engagement of the country with the largest economy and the largest environmental impact. In short, the United States is abdicating its historic role as the leader in efforts to protect the global environment.

Call me a dreamer, but it doesn't need to be this way. Although this Congress and the Obama administration have been unable to agree on much, they have been able to come together on some high profile treaties, including the New START treaty with Russia and trade agreements with Columbia, Panama, and South Korea. In the same spirit, Congress and the Obama administration should reinvigorate efforts to ratify these ten environmental treaties, so that the United States can reclaim global environmental leadership on these issues. Yes, we can.

## China will fill in for global environmental leadership

**Liu 13-** Peggy Liu, Chairperson of JUCCE, leads a coalition to catalyze smart grid, sustainable cities and consumerism, and foster international collaboration with China, advisor to M&S and HP and the WEF Global Agenda Council on Sustainable Consumption, and a WEF Young Global Leader, 2013 ("CHINA IS A MODEL FOR GOING GREEN (DESPITE WHAT YOU READ)," Ensia, September 10th, Available online at <http://ensia.com/voices/china-is-a-model-for-going-green-despite-what-you-read/>, Accessed 7-1-14)

September 10, 2013 — Even though China's skies are gray and waters run red, there is cause for hope that the country's "long green march" will have a blue sky ending — thanks to the unique way China deploys new clean technologies and practices. Since opening to the West, China has developed a refined process of piloting at city scale. Today these local piloting efforts allow China, more than any other country, to quickly try new environmental and sustainable initiatives and move successful ones toward wider implementation. The history of these efforts dates back to 1979, when China introduced three economic development zones that experimented locally with ideas such as local elections and internationalization of currencies. The success of those initial three zones led to the expansion of the zones to 14 cities in 1984. Today there are 253 economic development zones across the country. Such city-level experimentation has driven progress across China, and is now being

used for a broad range of sustainable technology and policy pilots. And this has all taken place during a 40-year urbanization spurt. China is now building the equivalent of every building in Canada each year — or half the new construction worldwide (about 2 billion square meters annually). China is throwing spaghetti at the wall, so to speak, one city at a time to see which eco-models work, and is systematically doing so with every promising green technology — moving from pilots to demonstrations to commercialization. At TEDxChCh, I spoke about how this is changing the country from the factory of the world to the clean tech laboratory of the world, and the only country able to experiment with green models on a gigascale.

## Environmental leadership high now- Obama's XO solves

**BBC News 6/17-** BBC News, 2014 ("Expansion of US marine protected zone could double world reserves," Matt McGrath, June 17th, Available online at <http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-27890072>, Accessed 7-1-14)

Ocean campaigners have welcomed the new US plan as an important step. "This is incredibly significant and shows global leadership from the US on this issue" said Karen Sack from the Pew Charitable Trusts. "There is an amazing array of biodiversity around these islands, there are sea mount systems with a lot of deep sea species, all types of marine mammals." Marine Protected Areas currently make up around 2.8% of the world's oceans - but Karen Sack says the areas that have a full ban on fishing, drilling and other activities are much smaller, which increases the significance of the US move. "Less than 1% of the global ocean is fully protected," she said. "While this area may be far away from anywhere the designation adds to the part of the ocean that is protected in this way which is critical." Conserving marine species isn't just the preserve of large nations like the US. In recent days the tiny Republic of Kiribati announced that the Phoenix Islands Protected Area, will close to all commercial fishing by the end of 2014. This fishing zone, which is close to the newly extended US MPA, is within a region that is home to the largest remaining stocks of tuna on Earth.



## 2NC Heg Unsustainable

### Decline is inevitable – wars, soft power, defense spending, China rise

**Geeraerts 11** [Gustaaf, professor of international relations at the Vrije Universiteit Brussel and director of the Brussels Institute of Contemporary China Studies, European Review, Vol. 19, No. 1, 57–67, 2011, “China, the EU, and the New Multipolarity,” <http://www.vub.ac.be/biccs/site/assets/files/apapers/China,%20the%20EU%20and%20Multipolarity-2.pdf>] WD

The structure of the international system is changing with the evaporation of America’s unipolar moment. **The decline of U.S. primacy and the subsequent transition to a multipolar world are inevitable,** Wang Jisi wrote in 2004. <sup>2</sup> More recently John Ikenberry stated that **‘The United States’ “unipolar moment” will inevitably end.’** <sup>3</sup> **Not only has the influence of the lonely superpower severely been affected by the expensive wars in Iraq and Afghanistan; its economic clout too has declined faster than ever before and its soft power is increasingly contested.** At the same time, **China is undeniably becoming a global power.** Since the cautious opening up of China’s door by Deng Xiaoping in 1978, her economy has quadrupled in size and some expect it to double again over the next decade. **China is about to become the second most important single economy in the world. At the most recent G20 meeting in Pittsburgh, Hu Jintao, China’s president was the only one to arrive at the head of a major economy still enjoying strong growth,** having the luxury of substantial financial reserves. But **China is not only growing economically, its military clout is also on the rise.** <sup>4</sup> In 2008 China evolved into the world’s second highest military spender. <sup>5</sup> **It is the only country emerging both as a military and economic rival of the US and thus generating a fundamental shift in the global distribution of power and influence.** Such power transitions are a recurring phenomenon in international politics and have always constituted episodes of uncertainty and higher risk. They contain the seeds of fierce strategic rivalry between the up-and-coming state and the residing leading power, thereby increasing the likelihood of contention and conflict. No wonder that China’s spectacular economic growth and increasingly assertive diplomacy have incited other key-players to ponder how Beijing will seek to manage this transition and even more how it will use its leverage afterwards. Notwithstanding that China still sees itself partly as a developing country, it is becoming more confident in its rising power and status. **As its economic interests abroad are expanding rapidly, so will the pressure increase to safeguard them more proactively. National security is no longer solely a matter of defending sovereignty and domestic development.** It also becomes necessary for China to back up its growing interests overseas with a more robust diplomacy and security policy. To be sure, the US is still the most important single economy in the world. It also remains the world’s largest military power. **While the EU has developed into an even larger economy and has become the most important entity in terms of external trade flows, politically and militarily it performs far below its potential and is no match either for the US or China.** The EU’s foreign policy is confronted with a collective action problem of sorts, and as a result is lacking in both strategic vision and assertiveness. Although still smaller than the other two, **China has grown into the world’s second largest national economy and also the one that grows most quickly.** According to some estimates, **China will move on a par with the US in 2020** and become the world’s biggest economy in 2030 (see Table 1). Moreover China is steadily increasing its military power. In Beijing’s view, economic prowess is not sufficient for a state to become a first rank power. ‘What is important is comprehensive national power, as shown by the ability of the Soviet Union to balance the much wealthier US in the Cold War and the continuing inability of an economically powerful Japan to play a political role’. <sup>6</sup> This view is very much in line with the neorealist conception that to be considered a ‘pole’ a country must amass sufficient power in all of Waltz’s categories of power: ‘size of population and territory, resource endowment, economic capability, military strength, political stability and competence.’ <sup>7</sup>

## 2NC Environmental Leadership High Now

### **US global environmental leadership high now**

**Hayward 8-** Steven F. Hayward, the F.K. Weyerhaeuser Fellow at AEI, 2008 ("The United States and the Environment: Laggard or Leader?," AEI, February 21st, Available online at <http://www.aei.org/article/energy-and-the-environment/the-united-states-and-the-environment-laggard-or-leader/>, Accessed 7-1-14)

To borrow the blunt language of Generation X and the "Millennials," does the United States suck when it comes to the environment? Contrary to the perception expressed in the epigraphs above, the answer turns out to be a resounding No; the United States remains the world's environmental leader and is likely to continue as such. But to paraphrase the old slogan of the propagandist, if a misperception is repeated long enough, it will become an unshakeable belief.

Environmental improvement in the United States has been substantial and dramatic almost across the board, as my annual Index of Leading Environmental Indicators and other books and reports like it have shown for more than a decade.[3] The chief drivers of this improvement are economic growth, constantly increasing resource efficiency, innovation in pollution control technology, and the deepening of environmental values among the American public that have translated into changed behavior and consumer preferences. Government regulation has played a vital role to be sure, but in the grand scheme of things, regulation can be understood as a lagging indicator that often achieves results at needlessly high cost. Were it not for rising affluence and technological innovation, regulation would have much the same effect as King Canute commanding the tides.

But in a variation of the old complaint "what have you done for me lately?" there is widespread perception that the United States lags behind Europe and other leading nations on environmental performance. This perception is more strongly held abroad than here in the United States.

## 2NC Heg Bad

### **US Hegemony causes war in the South China Sea- Turns case**

**Glaser 14** (John, Editor at Antiwar.com. He has been published at The Washington Times, “Abandon Hegemony in Asia-Pacific, Or Risk Catastrophic War,” Antiwar.com, January 7 2014, <http://antiwar.com/blog/2014/01/17/abandon-hegemony-in-asia-pacific-or-risk-catastrophic-war/>)

Denny Roy, a Senior Fellow at the East-West Center, writes at *The Diplomat* that the crux of the tensions between the U.S. and China is a contest for power in the Asia-Pacific region. The squabbling over competing sovereignty claims of this or that island chain in the East and South China Seas, he writes, is peripheral to the real battle for regional hegemony.¶ A Chinese sphere of influence here would require the eviction of American strategic leadership, including U.S. military bases and alliances in Japan and South Korea, U.S. “regional policeman” duties, and most of the security cooperation between America and friends in the region that now occurs. Washington is not ready to give up this role, seeing a strong presence in the western Pacific rim and the ability to shape regional affairs as crucial to American security.¶ A basic problem, then, is that Beijing wants a sphere of influence, while Washington is not willing to accede it.¶ I’m reminded of the stark choice put forth in Noam Chomsky’s 2003 book *Hegemony or Survival*. Relying on official documents, Chomsky warned that it is dangerous that “the declared intention of the most powerful state in history [is] to maintain its hegemony through the threat or use of military force, the dimension of power in which it reigns supreme.”¶ In the official rhetoric of the National Security Strategy, “Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military build-up in hopes of surpassing, or equaling, the power of the United States.”¶ One well-known international affairs specialist, John Ikenberry, describes the declaration as a “grand strategy [that] begins with a fundamental commitment to maintaining a unipolar world in which the United States has no peer competitor,” a condition that is to be “permanent [so] that no state or coalition could ever challenge [the U.S.] as global leader, protector, and enforcer.”¶ Ikenberry went on to say this quest for permanent hegemony threatens to “leave the world more dangerous and divided – and the United States less secure.” America’s current defense posture in Asia – to back all of China’s neighboring rivals in an attempt to curb China’s regional ambitions – is at once an attempt to implement this hegemonic grand strategy and a threat to peace.¶ “My biggest fear is that a small mishap is going to blow up into something much bigger,” says Elizabeth C. Economy of the Council on Foreign Relations. “If there is a use of force between Japan and China,” warns her colleague Sheila A. Smith, “this could be all-out conflict between these two Asian giants. And as a treaty ally of Japan, it will automatically involve the United States.”¶ As I’ve written, maintaining global hegemony does ordinary Americans little good. Such an exclusive hold on power in the sphere of international relations is greatly beneficial to political elites and the wealthy entities to which they are closely tied, but not much for the general population. Given this, the question of whether we prefer maintaining hegemony to “all-out conflict” in the Asia-Pacific is pertinent. We can either continue to risk catastrophic conflict between two of the world’s most powerful states, or, as Roy puts it, “accede” to China’s regional ambitions which, after all, mirror America’s own regional ambitions when it was a rising power.

# **Terrorism Core**

## 1NC Frontline – Long

### 1. The containers are the focus of the attacks-- aff can't solve further inspection

### 2. Port Economy is impossibly resilient--- multiple warrants

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and

Cost" Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast.

After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP))

Although the United States is considerably more trade-dependent today than in earlier periods, this potential vulnerability is offset by a number of factors. One is the shift from ship to aircraft for delivery of many high-value, time-sensitive goods, particularly on the export side. Second, countermeasures to a terrorist strike, such as increased inspections of containers, may be more onerous for imports coming from uncertain ports than for exports packaged in the United States. And although a widespread labor action would stop most maritime trade completely, a terrorist strike would only slow trade rather than stop it. When added together, these factors mean that the disruption to the flow of goods as a result of a current terrorist attack could be roughly similar in size to the effect of a major port strike in the 1960s.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, we feel that these historic labor actions correspond closely enough to the kind of port disruption that a terrorist attack might bring to tell us a lot about the probable effect on the national economy of a terrorist attack on the ports. We will show how these labor actions are visible in the import data and export data of the period. In all cases, there was a small increase in import volume before these actions, a drop in volume during the action, and a large surge in import volume after the dispute was settled. **Because of the size of that postdisruption volume surge, the overall loss of trade during a labor action was very small and in some cases nonexistent. Trade was postponed but not lost.** Nor are the adverse effects of labor actions evident in other data that we have examined, including data reporting production and employment. **Our results show quite conclusively that the effect of these past strikes on the greater economy was negligible.** This is testimony partly to the great resilience of a modern economy. **Short interruptions to supply chains can be mitigated fully by drawing down inventories, especially if they were built up in anticipation of the event.** When inventories are depleted and delivery essential, cargo can be shifted to air or land through a neighboring economy. **Somewhat longer interruptions can be compensated for through a temporary shift to domestic suppliers—an especially easy alternative if supply chains have built-in redundancies that allow the needed flexibility.** Some consumers at the end of the supply chain may have to wait a while or pay higher prices. The sale—and profits—may be postponed, but they are not prevented. Our results d

o not say that no business was hurt by port labor actions or that profits were not adversely affected by the increase in transaction costs. Some industries, some firms, and some regions were surely adversely

affected. Nor do we claim that a terrorist attack on the ports and the resultant disruption to the supply chain would not harm any region or company—certainly some firms and regions would be affected. However, as is often the case in a modern complex economy, when one industry or area suffers as a result of some economic disturbance, another prospers as a result of an offsetting shift in demand: **There are winners and losers.** Our main point here is that these past disruptions were insufficient to cause any noticeable change in the aggregate flow of the economy: Either the losses were small compared with the overall economy or they were largely offset by gains elsewhere. We believe that the same would be likely after a terrorist attack on a port: Its effects are not likely to show up other than in imports and exports.

### 3. Econ is resilient--- an attack would only cause short term shocks

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and

**Cost"** Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP))

It is **easy, however, to overestimate these secondary effects.** We have to be careful about distinguishing between events that cause business to be delayed and those that cause business to be cancelled. Very short-run disruptions to trade—whether by severe weather, traffic problems at the port, or a small terrorist attack—have almost no net effect on the economy, since the disruptions caused are little more than what happens during the normal, random, day-to-day life of commerce. **Small delays have no measurable effect, and firms very often have excess capacity in order to deal with unexpected fluctuations in demand.** And although consumers might stop flying as a result of an incident, they may instead begin to buy more cars with the money they did not spend on air travel. **Losses in one place may be offset by gains elsewhere.** Only sustained shocks to the economy will have any permanent effect on the economy, and here we must be careful to recognize that the economy is composed of conscious agents who will adjust plans and use resources in different37 ways to mitigate damages. We must not underestimate the resilience of a free-enterprise economy

### 4.9/11 proves that shocks to trade dont cause a recession--multiple warrants

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and

**Cost"** Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson

Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP)

September 11 Did Not Cause the 2001 Recession There is a strong tendency to blame too many secondary effects on disasters. A good example of this phenomenon is found in the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. In the days after the attacks, the rhetoric regarding the potential effect on the national economy was both **loud and wrong**. The theory proposed by many analysts and journalists was that psychologically fragile consumers in the United States would suffer a crisis and stop spending, driving the economy into a deeper recession. Support for this theory came from the first Gulf War, which supposedly caused a similar consumer crisis of confidence that in turn drove us into a recession in 1990. For example, the Wall Street Journal reported on September 13, 2001: "Past shocks to America's sense of security, such as the Oklahoma City bombing or the Gulf War, have prompted consumers to pull back temporarily on major purchases and other discretionary spending," said Richard Curtin, director of surveys of consumers at the University of Michigan. He expects a similar reaction now, which could mean a rough time in the next several weeks for the economy, which was already struggling with rising jobless rates and high consumer debt burdens. "We were teetering on the edge, and this might well push us over," said Mr. Curtin. **This hypothesis ignores the facts and completely overstates the psychological fragility of American consumers. The 1990 recession was not caused by the first Gulf War at all.** Residential investment and expenditures on consumer durables typically are leading indicators of the economy. When spending on these items begins to fall as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP), this is a strong indication of an underlying weakness in the economy that will create a recession. Expenditures in these two sectors had dropped from 14 percent of GDP to below 12 percent of GDP in the three years preceding the 1990 downturn—and before the Gulf war. There has never been such a drop that did not eventually lead to a recession, with one exception—in 1967, when the economy was wobbling, appearing to be on the verge of recession, the sharp increase in spending for the Vietnam War propelled the economy forward. **This was just the reverse of what Mr. Curtin suggested.** Similarly, the U.S. economy did not slow down after the September 11 attacks; indeed, the economy was in the midst of accelerating its way out of the 2001 business-led downturn that had begun in the middle of 2000. And although consumer confidence fell sharply after the attacks, consumer spending in the fourth quarter grew at an unprecedented 7 percent seasonally adjusted annual rate (SAAR), one of the sharpest increases seen in the past decade (Figure 2.2). Unemployment did rise sharply after the event, but this seemed to be primarily an acceleration of the employment loss that would have been expected given the weak economic climate. This was especially true because **labor markets were still overheated from the tech-fueled economic boom of the late nineties.** Retail sales did drop sharply in September 2001 but also rebounded sharply in October and returned to trend in November—business Figure 2.2—Growth in Real GDP and Consumer Spending, 2000–2002<sup>39</sup> delayed, not business cancelled. Indeed, it is hard to find any evidence of an effect of the September 11 attacks on the aggregate economy, with the exception of that on the air travel industry. Even in that case, the industry was in deep trouble beforehand, with profit margins dipping into the red

in the beginning of 2000—long before the attacks. **Even then, it must be remembered that total consumer spending went up, so the dollars that were not spent on air travel went to some other part of the economy**

## **5. Port econ is incredible resilient--an attack would not be able to destroy the ports ability to operate**

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost"

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP)

A cursory look would seem to portend a dramatic, dangerous scenario, but a closer look at the facts suggests otherwise. From an input-output perspective, a wide variety of holes would be quickly created in the flow of production that would seem to lead to a very sharp downturn in economic activity. **But our economy is not a mechanical system; it is an organic self-healing system**, much like that of a human being: Large injuries take time to heal, but for the most part they do eventually heal. To continue the analogy, a port attack is only a cut on the arm—quickly healed with little noticeable effect on the day-to-day functioning of the person. Although the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach certainly represent a primary infrastructure target in the United States, a complete shutdown of the ports is highly unlikely as a direct result of some physical attack. **There are two reasons for this: the sheer physical scale of the facilities and the large amount of excess physical capacity** (as opposed to human capital capacity) currently in place. As shown in the port map on p. xxiii, the two facilities take up approximately 12 square miles of space in a six-by-four-mile area. The complex is broken into a number of separate yards, each completely controlled by a number of independent, competing major shipping lines, each of which have substantial investment in the physical cranes and equipment on their property. Some of these yards are on Terminal Island, connected to the mainland by three road bridges and a railroad; others are on the mainland itself. There are multiple access points into the area as the map shows, including two highways. Even if these roads were shut down, it would be relatively simple to construct a temporary bridge to the island, and although it might have some implications for the movement of ships, no yard would be effectively isolated.<sup>3</sup> Conventional weapons would be able to damage, at best, only a small portion of the complex, and would be unable to isolate a substantial portion of the port given the multiple access routes into and out of the area. **Even a so-called "dirty bomb" could cover only one or two square miles of area with radioactivity.** Given the location on the water, winds would quickly blow most of the radioactive materials away, leaving even most of the initially affected area quickly reusable. The only known weapon that could take out an area of this size for an extended period of time would be a nuclear weapon. It seems more likely that the Temporary bridges are used in many circumstances surrounding disasters, construction, and military action. For



example, the Bailey Bridge Company ([www.baileybridge.com/](http://www.baileybridge.com/)) produces bridges that can be set up in days for use in construction zones. This company began by providing pontoon bridges in World War II that could carry tanks that commonly weigh 30 to 35 tons. The U.S. Army has a special group, the 299th Engineer Company (Multi-Role Bridge Company), which specializes in building pontoon bridges. The 299th built one over the Euphrates River in 2003 during the Iraq conflict. This float bridge was 185 meters long.<sup>45</sup> target of such a horrific device would be a densely populated area, not a port. Given that it is unlikely for the entire port complex to be closed for an extended period as a result of an attack, the next question is what would happen if an attack instead destroyed only a portion of the port facilities. Under this scenario, the effect on trade and any secondary effects would depend on the ability of the functioning portions of the port to pick up the slack. Although the stories of congestion at the port and ongoing plans for expansion seem to imply that the ports are running close to or at capacity, **they are not actually near capacity—at least not from a physical perspective.** Most of the year, the various facilities run only one shift per day. During periods of increased trade activity, they may run two or, in the most desperate of circumstances, three. Multiple shifts, however, are very unusual because of the increased labor costs and work restrictions of labor agreements. **But if the manpower were available, each yard in the facility could likely move at least twice as much merchandise through if it ran 24 hours a day.** Indeed, this point has been made clearer than ever in recent months as local officials have moved decisively to reduce midday congestion around the ports by charging a fee to companies that want to move goods and products into and out of the ports during normal business hours. It is understood that the port infrastructure is largely underused during most of the day, and that economic incentives are needed to use it more efficiently. If a portion of the complex were closed as a result of damage to its transportation infrastructure, it would be relatively simple to transfer the shipping into other facilities. We assume that in the event of a national emergency, competing shipping companies would share facilities.

## 6.A terror attack would not affect the entirety of the port economy-- other sectors pick up the pace

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost"

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf)//AKP)

Furthermore, the labor stoppages of earlier eras had a dual effect on the economy because they stopped both exports and imports. **For the terrorist scenario we lay out, we feel that such an attack would affect imports far more than exports, reducing the overall size of the shock to the economy.**

The shift in the composition of trade would also attenuate the effect on the economy. Non-petroleum industrial supplies made up 36 percent of all goods imports in 1967, whereas consumer and other

products made up only 22 percent. By comparison, industrial supplies make up only 15 percent of imports now, whereas consumer and other goods make up 31 percent. If a critical component of a manufacturing line fails to arrive, that might cause widespread disruption, **but the lack of yet another lamp made in China on Wal-Mart shelves would not.** Indeed, such disturbance to the patterns of trade flows could create additional consumption demand for products made here—temporarily improving the job markets in manufacturing. Additionally, domestic production of goods is now a smaller proportion of GDP, implying that a disturbance to supply chains into the goods sectors would have a smaller overall effect on the economy. In the sixties, the production of goods made up nearly half of the economy. Today, it is far less than a third, as services have been the primary growth portion of the economy. Finally, communication and information-sharing is far easier than it was 30 years ago, making it easier for firms to find alternative suppliers or alternative routes for products in the event of some disturbance to their supply chain. **The result is that firms are more nimble and more capable of efficiently handling problems with their supply chains, not less.** Other efficiencies include shorter production runs and an increase in firms in the supplier business that now tout their ability to provide special needs in short order. As for our just-in-time economy, although it is true that the inventory-to-sales ratio has fallen from 1.69 to 1.36 for manufacturing industries in the past 40 years, it has actually increased for the wholesale and retail trade sectors (Table 2.3). **All these factors indicate that although past port shutdowns may not be the perfect example of the effect of a terrorist attack on our ports today, they should be very informative.** We might consider this a low estimate for the potential for disturbance to the aggregate economy, but it is certainly a solid estimate

## 7.No impact to economic decline – prefer new data

Daniel **Drezner 14**, IR prof at Tufts, The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession, World Politics, Volume 66. Number 1, January 2014, pp. 123-164

The final significant outcome addresses a dog that hasn't barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple **analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force** as a tool for staying in power.<sup>42</sup> They voiced genuine concern that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict—whether **through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict.** Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fueled impressions of a surge in global public disorder. **The aggregate data suggest otherwise**, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has concluded that **"the average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007."**<sup>43</sup> **Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis, as have military expenditures in most sampled countries.** Other **studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict**, as Lotta Themner and Peter Wallensteen conclude: "[T]he pattern is one of relative stability when we consider the trend for the past five years."<sup>44</sup> **The secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed.** Rogers Brubaker observes that **"the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected."**<sup>45</sup>

## 8.No terrorism—no linkages, experts, your evidence is alarmism, data,

John **Mueller** political scientist at Ohio State and co-author of *Terror, Security, and Money: Balancing the Risks, Benefits, and Costs of Homeland Security* “Has the threat from terrorism been exaggerated?”

The Commentator **1/8/14**

[http://www.thecommentator.com/article/4579/has\\_the\\_threat\\_from\\_terrorism\\_be\\_en\\_exaggerated](http://www.thecommentator.com/article/4579/has_the_threat_from_terrorism_be_en_exaggerated)

Two years after the raid on Osama bin Laden’s hideaway, terrorism alarmists remain in peak form explaining that although al-Qaeda has been weakened it still manages to present a grave threat.

Various well-honed techniques are applied to support this contention. One is to espouse and assess various “linkages” or “connections” of “ties” or “threads” between and among a range of disparate terrorists or terrorist groups, most of which appear rather gossamer and of only limited consequence on closer examination.

Another is to exaggerate the importance and effectiveness of the “affiliated groups” linked to al-Qaeda central. In particular, alarmists point to the al-Qaeda affiliate in chaotic Yemen, ominously hailing it as the “deadliest” and the “most aggressive” of these and a “major threat.”

Yet its chief efforts at international terrorism have failed abysmally: an underwear bomb and laser printer bombs on cargo planes. With that track record, the group may pose a problem or concern, but it scarcely presents a “major threat” outside of war zones.

More generally, “al-Qaeda is its own worst enemy,” as Robert Grenier, a former top CIA counterterrorism official, notes. “Where they have succeeded initially, they very quickly discredit themselves.”

Any terrorist threat within the developed world seems even less impressive. The Boston terrorists of 2013 were the first in the United States since 9/11 in which Islamist terrorists actually were able to assemble and detonate bombs -- albeit very primitive ones. But except for that, they do not seem to have been more competent than most of their predecessors.

Amazingly, they apparently thought they could somehow get away with their deed even though they chose to set their bombs off at the most-photographed spot on the planet at the time. Moreover, they had no coherent plan of escape and, as commonly found, no ability to explain how killing a few random people would advance their cause.

While the scope of the tragedy in Boston should not be minimized, it should also be noted that if the terrorists’ aim was to kill a large number of people, their bombs failed miserably. As recent cases in Colorado and Connecticut sadly demonstrate, far more fatalities have been inflicted by gunmen.

Before Boston, some 16 people had been killed by Islamist terrorists in the United States in the years since 2001, and all of these were murdered by people who were essentially acting alone. By contrast, in the 1970s, organized terrorists inflicted hundreds of attacks, mostly bombings, in the United States, killing 72.

As concern about organized attacks has diminished, fear of “lone wolf” attacks has grown in recent years, and one official assessment contends that “lone offenders currently present the greatest threat.”

This is a reasonable observation, but those concerned should keep in mind that, as analyst Max Abrahms has noted, while lone wolves may be difficult to police, they have carried out only two of the 1,900 most deadly terrorist attacks over the last four decades.

The key question, at least outside of war zones, is not, “are we safer?” but “how safe are we?”

At current rates, an American’s chance of becoming a victim of terrorism in the U.S., even with 9/11 in the calculation, is about 1 in 3.5 million per year. In comparison, that same American stands a 1 in 22,000 yearly chance of becoming a homicide victim, a 1 in 8,000 chance of perishing in an auto accident, and a 1 in 500 chance of dying from cancer.

These calculations are based, of course, on historical data. However, alarmists who would reject such history need to explain why they think terrorists will suddenly become vastly more competent in the future.

But no one seems to be making that argument. Indeed, notes one reporter, U.S. officials now say that al-Qaeda has become less capable of a large attack like 9/11. But she also says that they made this disclosure only on condition of anonymity out of fear that “publicly identifying themselves could make them a target” of terrorists.

In contrast, one terrorism specialist, Peter Bergen, has observed in heroic full attribution mode that, “The last terror attack (in the West) was seven years ago in London,” that there “haven’t been any major attacks in the U.S.” and that “they are recruiting no-hopers and dead-enders.”

## 9.No desire, no market, and locks check.

Mueller, Political Science at Ohio State, 11 [John, Professor of Political Science at Ohio State, The Truth About Al-Qaeda, August 2, 2011, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68012/john-mueller/the-truth-about-al-qaeda?page=show>]

Thus far terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists on the issue, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. It is highly improbable that a would-be atomic terrorist would be given or sold a bomb by a generous like-minded nuclear state because the donor could not control its use and because the ultimate source of the weapon might be discovered. Although there has been great worry about terrorists illicitly stealing or purchasing a nuclear weapon, it seems likely that neither “loose nukes” nor a market in illicit nuclear materials exists. Moreover, finished bombs have been outfitted with an array of locks and safety devices. There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were utterly to fail, collapsing in full disarray. However, even under those conditions, nuclear weapons would likely remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb would most likely end up going off in their own territory, would still have locks, and could probably be followed and hunted down by an alarmed international community. The most plausible route for terrorists would be to manufacture the device themselves from purloined materials. This task requires that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered in sequence, including the effective recruitment of people who at once have great technical skills and will remain completely devoted to the cause. In addition, a host of corrupted co-conspirators, many of them foreign, must remain utterly reliable, international and local security services must be kept perpetually in the dark, and no curious outsider must get consequential wind of the project over the months or even years it takes to pull off. In addition, the financial costs of the operation could easily become monumental. Moreover, the difficulties are likely to increase because of enhanced protective and policing efforts by self-interested governments and because any foiled attempt would expose flaws in the defense system. holes the defenders would then plug. The evidence of al-Qaeda’s desire to go atomic, and about its progress in accomplishing this exceedingly difficult task, is remarkably skimpy, if not completely negligible. The scariest stuff—a decade’s worth of loose nuke rumor—seems to have no substance whatever. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in an al-Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan: “Make use of that which is available ... rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your

reach.” In part because of current policies—but also because of a wealth of other technical and organizational difficulties—the atomic terrorists’ task is already monumental, and their likelihood of success is vanishingly small. Efforts to further enhance this monumentality, if cost-effective and accompanied with only tolerable side effects, are generally desirable.

## **1NC Frontline – Short**

### **1. The containers are the focus of the attacks-- aff can't solve further inspection**

### **2.Port Economy is impossibly resilient--- multiple warrants**

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and

Cost" Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast.

After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP)

Although the United States is considerably more trade-dependent today than in earlier periods, this potential vulnerability is offset by a number of factors. One is the shift from ship to aircraft for delivery of many high-value, time-sensitive goods, particularly on the export side. Second, countermeasures to a terrorist strike, such as increased inspections of containers, may be more onerous for imports coming from uncertain ports than for exports packaged in the United States. And although a widespread labor action would stop most maritime trade completely, a terrorist strike would only slow trade rather than stop it. When added together, these factors mean that the disruption to the flow of goods as a result of a current terrorist attack could be roughly similar in size to the effect of a major port strike in the 1960s.<sup>34</sup> Therefore, we feel that these historic labor actions correspond closely enough to the kind of port disruption that a terrorist attack might bring to tell us a lot about the probable effect on the national economy of a terrorist attack on the ports. We will show how these labor actions are visible in the import data and export data of the period. In all cases, there was a small increase in import volume before these actions, a drop in volume during the action, and a large surge in import volume after the dispute was settled. **Because of the size of that postdisruption volume surge, the overall loss of trade during a labor action was very small and in some cases nonexistent. Trade was postponed but not lost.** Nor are the adverse effects of labor actions evident in other data that we have examined, including data reporting production and employment. **Our results show quite conclusively that the effect of these past strikes on the greater economy was negligible.** This is testimony partly to the great resilience of a modern economy. **Short interruptions to supply chains can be mitigated fully by drawing down inventories, especially if they were built up in anticipation of the event.** When inventories are depleted and delivery essential, cargo can be shifted to air or land through a neighboring economy. **Somewhat longer interruptions can be compensated for through a temporary shift to domestic suppliers—an especially easy alternative if supply chains have built-in redundancies that allow the needed flexibility.** Some consumers at the end of the supply chain may have to wait a while or pay higher prices. The sale—and profits—may be postponed, but they are not prevented. Our results d

o not say that no business was hurt by port labor actions or that profits were not adversely affected by the increase in transaction costs. Some industries, some firms, and some regions were surely adversely affected. Nor do we claim that a terrorist attack on the ports and the resultant disruption to the supply chain would not harm any region or company—certainly some firms and regions would be affected.

However, as is often the case in a modern complex economy, when one industry or area suffers as a result of some economic disturbance, another prospers as a result of an offsetting shift in demand: **There are winners and losers.** Our main point here is that these past disruptions were insufficient to cause any noticeable change in the aggregate flow of the economy: Either the losses were small compared with the overall economy or they were largely offset by gains elsewhere. We believe that the same would be likely after a terrorist attack on a port: Its effects are not likely to show up other than in imports and exports.

### 3.No impact to economic decline – prefer new data

Daniel **Drezner 14**, IR prof at Tufts, The System Worked: Global Economic Governance during the Great Recession, World Politics, Volume 66. Number 1, January 2014, pp. 123-164

The final significant outcome addresses a dog that hasn't barked: the effect of the Great Recession on cross-border conflict and violence. During the initial stages of the crisis, multiple analysts asserted that the financial crisis would lead states to increase their use of force as a tool for staying in power.<sup>42</sup> They voiced genuine concern that the global economic downturn would lead to an increase in conflict—whether through greater internal repression, diversionary wars, arms races, or a ratcheting up of great power conflict. Violence in the Middle East, border disputes in the South China Sea, and even the disruptions of the Occupy movement fueled impressions of a surge in global public disorder. **The aggregate data suggest otherwise**, however. The Institute for Economics and Peace has concluded that "the average level of peacefulness in 2012 is approximately the same as it was in 2007."<sup>43</sup> Interstate violence in particular has declined since the start of the financial crisis, as have military expenditures in most sampled countries. Other studies confirm that the Great Recession has not triggered any increase in violent conflict, as Lotta Themner and Peter Wallensteen conclude: "[T]he pattern is one of relative stability when we consider the trend for the past five years."<sup>44</sup> The secular decline in violence that started with the end of the Cold War has not been reversed. Rogers Brubaker observes that "the crisis has not to date generated the surge in protectionist nationalism or ethnic exclusion that might have been expected."<sup>43</sup>

### 4.No terrorism—no linkages, experts, your evidence is alarmism, data,

John **Mueller** political scientist at Ohio State and co-author of Terror, Security, and Money: Balancing the Risks, Benefits, and Costs of Homeland Security “Has the threat from terrorism been exaggerated?”

The Commentator **1/8/14**

[http://www.thecommentator.com/article/4579/has\\_the\\_threat\\_from\\_terrorism\\_be\\_en\\_exaggerated](http://www.thecommentator.com/article/4579/has_the_threat_from_terrorism_be_en_exaggerated)

Two years after the raid on Osama bin Laden’s hideaway, terrorism alarmists remain in peak form explaining that although al-Qaeda has been weakened it still manages to present a grave threat.

Various well-honed techniques are applied to support this contention. One is to spy and assess various “linkages” or “connections” of “ties” or “threads” between and among a range of disparate terrorists or terrorist groups, most of which appear rather gossamer and of only limited consequence on closer examination.

Another is to exaggerate the importance and effectiveness of the “affiliated groups” linked to al-Qaeda central. In particular, alarmists point to the al-Qaeda affiliate in chaotic Yemen, ominously hailing it as the “deadliest” and the “most aggressive” of these and a “major threat.”

Yet its chief efforts at international terrorism have failed abysmally: an underwear bomb and laser printer bombs on cargo planes. With that track record, the group may pose a problem or concern, but it scarcely presents a “major threat” outside of war zones.

More generally, “al-Qaeda is its own worst enemy,” as Robert Grenier, a former top CIA counterterrorism official, notes. “Where they have succeeded initially, they very quickly discredit themselves.”

Any terrorist threat within the developed world seems even less impressive. The Boston terrorists of 2013 were the first in the United States since 9/11 in which Islamist terrorists actually were able to assemble and detonate bombs – albeit very primitive ones. But except for that, they do not seem to have been more competent than most of their predecessors.

Amazingly, they apparently thought they could somehow get away with their deed even though they chose to set their bombs off at the most-photographed spot on the planet at the time. Moreover, they had no coherent plan of escape and, as commonly found, no ability to explain how killing a few random people would advance their cause.

While the scope of the tragedy in Boston should not be minimized, it should also be noted that if the terrorists’ aim was to kill a large number of people, their bombs failed miserably. As recent cases in Colorado and Connecticut sadly demonstrate, far more fatalities have been inflicted by gunmen.

Before Boston, some 16 people had been killed by Islamist terrorists in the United States in the years since 2001, and all of these were murdered by people who were essentially acting alone. By contrast, in the 1970s, organized terrorists inflicted hundreds of attacks, mostly bombings, in the United States, killing 72.

As concern about organized attacks has diminished, fear of “lone wolf” attacks has grown in recent years, and one official assessment contends that “lone offenders currently present the greatest threat.”

This is a reasonable observation, but those concerned should keep in mind that, as analyst Max Abrahms has noted, while lone wolves may be difficult to police, they have carried out only two of the 1,900 most deadly terrorist attacks over the last four decades.

The key question, at least outside of war zones, is not, “are we safer?” but “how safe are we?”

At current rates, an American’s chance of becoming a victim of terrorism in the U.S., even with 9/11 in the calculation, is about 1 in 3.5 million per year. In comparison, that same American stands a 1 in 22,000 yearly chance of becoming a homicide victim, a 1 in 8,000 chance of perishing in an auto accident, and a 1 in 500 chance of dying from cancer.

These calculations are based, of course, on historical data. However, alarmists who would reject such history need to explain why they think terrorists will suddenly become vastly more competent in the future.

But no one seems to be making that argument. Indeed, notes one reporter, U.S. officials now say that al-Qaeda has become less capable of a large attack like 9/11. But she also says that they made this disclosure only on condition of anonymity out of fear that “publicly identifying themselves could make them a target” of terrorists.



In contrast, one terrorism specialist, Peter Bergen, has observed in heroic full attribution mode that, "The last terror attack (in the West) was seven years ago in London," that there "haven't been any major attacks in the U.S.," and that "they are recruiting no-hopers and dead-enders."

## no nuke terror exts

### **No desire, no market, and locks check.**

Mueller, Political Science at Ohio State, 11 [John, Professor of Political Science at Ohio State, The Truth About Al-Qaeda, August 2, 2011, <http://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/68012/john-mueller/the-truth-about-al-qaeda?page=show>]

Thus far terrorist groups seem to have exhibited only limited desire and even less progress in going atomic. This may be because, after brief exploration of the possible routes, they, unlike generations of alarmists on the issue, have discovered that the tremendous effort required is scarcely likely to be successful. It is highly improbable that a would-be atomic terrorist would be given or sold a bomb by a generous like-minded nuclear state because the donor could not control its use and because the ultimate source of the weapon might be discovered. Although there has been great worry about terrorists illicitly stealing or purchasing a nuclear weapon, it seems likely that neither “loose nukes” nor a market in illicit nuclear materials exists. Moreover, finished bombs have been outfitted with an array of locks and safety devices. There could be dangers in the chaos that would emerge if a nuclear state were utterly to fail, collapsing in full disarray. However, even under those conditions, nuclear weapons would likely remain under heavy guard by people who know that a purloined bomb would most likely end up going off in their own territory, would still have locks, and could probably be followed and hunted down by an alarmed international community. The most plausible route for terrorists would be to manufacture the device themselves from purloined materials. This task requires that a considerable series of difficult hurdles be conquered in sequence, including the effective recruitment of people who at once have great technical skills and will remain completely devoted to the cause. In addition, a host of corrupted co-conspirators, many of them foreign, must remain utterly reliable, international and local security services must be kept perpetually in the dark, and no curious outsider must get consequential wind of the project over the months or even years it takes to pull off. In addition, the financial costs of the operation could easily become monumental. Moreover, the difficulties are likely to increase because of enhanced protective and policing efforts by self-interested governments and because any foiled attempt would expose flaws in the defense system. holes the defenders would then plug. The evidence of al-Qaeda’s desire to go atomic, and about its progress in accomplishing this exceedingly difficult task, is remarkably skimpy, if not completely negligible. The scariest stuff—a decade’s worth of loose nuke rumor—seems to have no substance whatever. For the most part, terrorists seem to be heeding the advice found in an al-Qaeda laptop seized in Pakistan: “Make use of that which is available ... rather than waste valuable time becoming despondent over that which is not within your reach.” In part because of current policies—but also because of a wealth of other technical and organizational difficulties—the atomic terrorists’ task is already monumental, and their likelihood of success is vanishingly small. Efforts to further enhance this monumentality, if cost-effective and accompanied with only tolerable side effects, are generally desirable.

## exts-port econ resilient

### **Port Econ is resilient--- an attack would only cause short term shocks**

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost"

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP)

It is **easy, however, to overestimate these secondary effects.** We have to be careful about distinguishing between events that cause business to be delayed and those that cause business to be cancelled. Very short-run disruptions to trade—whether by severe weather, traffic problems at the port, or a small terrorist attack—have almost no net effect on the economy, since the disruptions caused are little more than what happens during the normal, random, day-to-day life of commerce. **Small delays have no measurable effect, and firms very often have excess capacity in order to deal with unexpected fluctuations in demand.** And although consumers might stop flying as a result of an incident, they may instead begin to buy more cars with the money they did not spend on air travel. **Losses in one place may be offset by gains elsewhere.** Only sustained shocks to the economy will have any permanent effect on the economy, and here we must be careful to recognize that the economy is composed of conscious agents who will adjust plans and use resources in different37 ways to mitigate damages. We must not underestimate the resilience of a free-enterprise economy

### **9/11 proves that shocks to trade dont cause a recession--multiple warrants**

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost"

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP)

September 11 Did Not Cause the 2001 Recession There is a strong tendency to blame too many secondary effects on disasters. A good example of this phenomenon is found in the September 11 attacks on New York and Washington, D.C. In the days after the attacks, the rhetoric regarding the potential effect on the national economy was both **loud and wrong.** The theory proposed by many

analysts and journalists was that psychologically fragile consumers in the United States would suffer a crisis and stop spending, driving the economy into a deeper recession. Support for this theory came from the first Gulf War, which supposedly caused a similar consumer crisis of confidence that in turn drove us into a recession in 1990. For example, the Wall Street Journal reported on September 13, 2001: "Past shocks to America's sense of security, such as the Oklahoma City bombing or the Gulf War, have prompted consumers to pull back temporarily on major purchases and other discretionary spending," said Richard Curtin, director of surveys of consumers at the University of Michigan. He expects a similar reaction now, which could mean a rough time in the next several weeks for the economy, which was already struggling with rising jobless rates and high consumer debt burdens. "We were teetering on the edge, and this might well push us over," said Mr. Curtin. **This hypothesis ignores the facts and completely overstates the psychological fragility of American consumers. The 1990 recession was not caused by the first Gulf War at all.** Residential investment and expenditures on consumer durables typically are leading indicators of the economy. When spending on these items begins to fall as a percentage of gross domestic product (GDP), this is a strong indication of an underlying weakness in the economy that will create a recession. Expenditures in these two sectors had dropped from 14 percent of GDP to below 12 percent of GDP in the three years preceding the 1990 downturn—and before the Gulf war. There has never been such a drop that did not eventually lead to a recession, with one exception—in 1967, when the economy was wobbling, appearing to be on the verge of recession, the sharp increase in spending for the Vietnam War propelled the economy forward. **This was just the reverse of what Mr. Curtin suggested.** Similarly, the U.S. economy did not slow down after the September 11 attacks; indeed, the economy was in the midst of accelerating its way out of the 2001 business-led downturn that had begun in the middle of 2000. And although consumer confidence fell sharply after the attacks, consumer spending in the fourth quarter grew at an unprecedented 7 percent seasonally adjusted annual rate (SAAR), one of the sharpest increases seen in the past decade (Figure 2.2). Unemployment did rise sharply after the event, but this seemed to be primarily an acceleration of the employment loss that would have been expected given the weak economic climate. This was especially true because **labor markets were still overheated from the tech-fueled economic boom of the late nineties.** Retail sales did drop sharply in September 2001 but also rebounded sharply in October and returned to trend in November—business Figure 2.2—Growth in Real GDP and Consumer Spending, 2000–2002<sup>39</sup> delayed, not business cancelled. Indeed, it is hard to find any evidence of an effect of the September 11 attacks on the aggregate economy, with the exception of that on the air travel industry. Even in that case, the industry was in deep trouble beforehand, with profit margins dipping into the red in the beginning of 2000—long before the attacks. **Even then, it must be remembered that total consumer spending went up, so the dollars that were not spent on air travel went to some other part of the economy**

## **Port econ is incredible resilient--an attack would not be able to destroy the ports ability to operate**

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost"

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the

Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP)

A cursory look would seem to portend a dramatic, dangerous scenario, but a closer look at the facts suggests otherwise. From an input-output perspective, a wide variety of holes would be quickly created in the flow of production that would seem to lead to a very sharp downturn in economic activity. **But our economy is not a mechanical system; it is an organic self-healing system**, much like that of a human being: Large injuries take time to heal, but for the most part they do eventually heal. To continue the analogy, a port attack is only a cut on the arm—quickly healed with little noticeable effect on the day-to-day functioning of the person. Although the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach certainly represent a primary infrastructure target in the United States, a complete shutdown of the ports is highly unlikely as a direct result of some physical attack. **There are two reasons for this: the sheer physical scale of the facilities and the large amount of excess physical capacity** (as opposed to human capital capacity) currently in place. As shown in the port map on p. xxiii, the two facilities take up approximately 12 square miles of space in a six-by-four-mile area. The complex is broken into a number of separate yards, each completely controlled by a number of independent, competing major shipping lines, each of which have substantial investment in the physical cranes and equipment on their property. Some of these yards are on Terminal Island, connected to the mainland by three road bridges and a railroad; others are on the mainland itself. There are multiple access points into the area as the map shows, including two highways. Even if these roads were shut down, it would be relatively simple to construct a temporary bridge to the island, and although it might have some implications for the movement of ships, no yard would be effectively isolated.<sup>3</sup> Conventional weapons would be able to damage, at best, only a small portion of the complex, and would be unable to isolate a substantial portion of the port given the multiple access routes into and out of the area. **Even a so-called “dirty bomb” could cover only one or two square miles of area with radioactivity.** Given the location on the water, winds would quickly blow most of the radioactive materials away, leaving even most of the initially affected area quickly reusable. The only known weapon that could take out an area of this size for an extended period of time would be a nuclear weapon. It seems more likely that the Temporary bridges are used in many circumstances surrounding disasters, construction, and military action. For example, the Bailey Bridge Company ([www.baileybridge.com/](http://www.baileybridge.com/)) produces bridges that can be set up in days for use in construction zones. This company began by providing pontoon bridges in World War II that could carry tanks that commonly weigh 30 to 35 tons. The U.S. Army has a special group, the 299th Engineer Company (Multi-Role Bridge Company), which specializes in building pontoon bridges. The 299th built one over the Euphrates River in 2003 during the Iraq conflict. This float bridge was 185 meters long.<sup>45</sup> target of such a horrific device would be a densely populated area, not a port. Given that it is unlikely for the entire port complex to be closed for an extended period as a result of an attack, the next question is what would happen if an attack instead destroyed only a portion of the port facilities. Under this scenario, the effect on trade and any secondary effects would depend on the ability of the functioning portions of the port to pick up the slack. Although the stories of congestion at the port and ongoing plans for expansion seem to imply that the ports are running close to or at capacity, **they are not actually near capacity—at least not from a physical perspective.** Most of the year, the various facilities run only one shift per day. During periods of increased trade activity, they may run two or, in

the most desperate of circumstances, three. Multiple shifts, however, are very unusual because of the increased labor costs and work restrictions of labor agreements. **But if the manpower were available, each yard in the facility could likely move at least twice as much merchandise through if it ran 24 hours a day.** Indeed, this point has been made clearer than ever in recent months as local officials have moved decisively to reduce midday congestion around the ports by charging a fee to companies that want to move goods and products into and out of the ports during normal business hours. It is understood that the port infrastructure is largely underused during most of the day, and that economic incentives are needed to use it more efficiently. If a portion of the complex were closed as a result of damage to its transportation infrastructure, it would be relatively simple to transfer the shipping into other facilities. We assume that in the event of a national emergency, competing shipping companies would share facilities.

## **A terror attack would not affect the entirety of the port economy-- other sectors pick up the pace**

Edward E. Leamer and Christopher Thornberg, "Protecting the Nation's Seaports: Balancing Security and Cost"

Edward E. Leamer is the Chauncey J. Medberry Professor of Management, professor of economics, and professor of statistics at UCLA, and director of the UCLA Anderson Forecast. After serving as assistant and associate professor at Harvard, he joined UCLA in 1975 and served as chair of the Economics Department from 1983 to 1987. In 1990, he moved to the Anderson Graduate School of Management. He received a B.A. in mathematics from Princeton University and an M.A. in mathematics and a Ph.D. in economics from the University of Michigan. He has published four books and more than 100 articles. His research papers in econometrics have been collected in *Sturdy Econometrics*, published in the Edward Elgar Series of Economists of the 20th Century. His research in international economics and econometric methodology has been discussed in *New Horizons in Economic Thought: Appraisals of Leading Economists*. He is a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and a fellow of the Econometric Society. He is also a research associate of the National Bureau of Economic Research and currently is on the advisory board of the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the U.S. Commerce Department. Christopher Thornberg is a senior economist with the UCLA Anderson Forecast and authors the Anderson Forecast for California as well as for the Los Angeles and East Bay regions. He specializes in international and labor economics. He has been involved in a number of special studies measuring the effect of important events on the economy, including the North American Free Trade Agreement, the California power crisis, and the September 11 terrorist attacks. He received his B.S. in business administration from the State University of New York at Buffalo and his Ph.D. in business economics from the Anderson School. He was previously on the faculty of the

Economics Department at Clemson University. UCLA Anderson Forecast, "Ports, Trade, and Terrorism: Balancing the Catastrophic and the Chronic", pg 31, [http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R\\_606JHR.pdf//AKP](http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/R_606JHR.pdf//AKP))

Furthermore, the labor stoppages of earlier eras had a dual effect on the economy because they stopped both exports and imports. For the terrorist scenario we lay out, we feel that such an attack would affect imports far more than exports, reducing the overall size of the shock to the economy. The shift in the composition of trade would also attenuate the effect on the economy. Non-petroleum industrial supplies made up 36 percent of all goods imports in 1967, whereas consumer and other products made up only 22 percent. By comparison, industrial supplies make up only 15 percent of imports now, whereas consumer and other goods make up 31 percent. If a critical component of a manufacturing line fails to arrive, that might cause widespread disruption, **but the lack of yet another lamp made in China on Wal-Mart shelves would not.** Indeed, such disturbance to the patterns of trade flows could create additional consumption demand for products made here—temporarily improving the job markets in manufacturing. Additionally, domestic production of goods is now a smaller proportion of GDP, implying that a disturbance to supply chains into the goods sectors would have a smaller overall effect on the economy. In the sixties, the production of goods made up nearly half of the economy. Today, it is far less than a third, as services have been the primary growth portion of the economy. Finally, communication and information-sharing is far easier than it was 30 years ago, making it easier for firms to find alternative suppliers or alternative routes for products in the event of some disturbance to their supply chain. The result is that firms are more nimble and more capable of efficiently handling problems with their supply chains, not less. Other efficiencies include shorter production runs and an

increase in firms in the supplier business that now tout their ability to provide special needs in short order. As for our just-in-time economy, although it is true that the inventory-to-sales ratio has fallen from 1.69 to 1.36 for manufacturing industries in the past 40 years, it has actually increased for the wholesale and retail trade sectors (Table 2.3). **All these factors indicate that although past port shutdowns may not be the perfect example of the effect of a terrorist attack on our ports today, they should be very informative.** We might consider this a low estimate for the potential for disturbance to the aggregate economy, but it is certainly a solid estimate.

## **Yes War Core**



## 1NC Yes War

**Obsolete doesn't mean impossible**—the fact that major wars are not in the best interests of states is not a reason that wars won't happen. Miscalculation and irrationality are inevitable.

**Great power war is possible and comes first – their evidence can't account for irrational actors, empirical deterrence flaws, or aggressive nationalism**

**Gosnell and Orzetti 12** [Rachael, Lieutenant Commander US Navy, Graduate Degree in International Security at Georgetown University, and Michael, Second Lieutenant US Marine Corps, Master's Degree from Georgetown University's Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service, Proceedings Magazine, April 2012, Vol. 138/4/1,310, "Now Hear This – Is Great-Power War Still Possible?," <http://www.usni.org/magazines/proceedings/2012-04/now-hear-great-power-war-still-possible>] WD

The Center for Naval Analyses recently published *Grand Strategy: Contemporary Contending Analyst Views and Implications for the U.S. Navy*, a survey of potential U.S. strategies being debated in the academic and defense communities. The study identifies four competing lines of strategic thought: maintaining American hegemony, selective engagement, offshore balancing, and integrating collective international efforts. Two additional options—isolationism and world government—are noted and disregarded as not viable. Under this list of strategic options a sharp division is apparent, dictated by the question, "Is great-power war obsolete?" This fundamental question must be answered before any logical strategic decisions can be made. If great-power war is possible, then the de facto existential threat to U.S. interests, latent in the international system, must be addressed before all others. There are enormous implications for weapon procurement, operational doctrine, and force levels driven by this single issue. Global strategists point to economic globalization and the proliferation of nuclear weapons as modern guarantors of peace among major powers. However, we contend that these very rational hedges against violence can still be shattered by decidedly irrational and reactionary forces. Thus, the possibility of great-power war between China and the United States cannot be ruled out. Economic interdependence offers benefits beyond the sheer transfer of capital and goods—there can be no doubt of that. However, history renders globalization's deterrent effects at least somewhat questionable. Substantial economic interdependence existed throughout Europe prior to World War I, and Japan was hugely dependent on American oil imports in the years leading up to World War II. It was this dependence that made the U.S oil embargo intolerable, ultimately motivating the Japanese to attack Pearl Harbor. On the other hand, the existential threat of nuclear weapons has certainly resulted in a universal desire keep Pandora's Box firmly shut. While we concede the remarkable ability of weapons of mass destruction to dampen the oscillations of great-power relations, it is unclear that the nuclear restraint against total war ever takes limited war off the table as a strategic option. More fundamentally, though, the arguments for a nuclear-based "state of peace" are constrained by the limits of rationality. Rational bounds do not apply to the ephemeral—yet extremely powerful—waves of bellicose nationalism that can sweep up an entire nation. National pride is embedded in the Chinese DNA—and rightly so. In certain segments of society, however, the sentiment manifests itself with a particular fervor, and some elements of the People's Liberation Army (PLA) epitomize this zeal. Alarming, the Communist Party leadership appears increasingly unable to act as a check on the military. Both Mao Zedong and Deng Xiaoping had ironclad control over the PLA, having earned unquestionable credibility during the Long March. Neither General Secretary of the Communist Party Hu Jintao nor First Secretary

Xi Jinping can claim a similar rapport with the PLA. Neither possesses a comparable level of control. Any surge of aggressive nationalism, either in the PLA or among the greater masses, could conceivably compel contemporary party leadership toward a bellicosity it does not desire. How might this happen? The two most likely scenarios deal with Chinese “core interests” in the Pacific: sovereignty in the South China Sea and Taiwan. The South China Sea is no stranger to conflict. Its location and material promise have led to a host of conflicting territorial claims and brought the Chinese and Vietnamese to armed conflict over the Spratly Islands in the late 1980s. After a period of relative calm, tensions have once again begun to flare. American commitment to freedom of the seas in the region, exemplified by Secretary of State Hillary Clinton’s July 2010 speech in Hanoi, Vietnam, provides ample opportunity for a Sino-American butting of heads. Similarly, the Republic of China remains a perennially sore issue for the Chinese; the furor over the sale of American F-16s provides an ample platform for future, more-polarizing interactions over Taiwan. War between China and the United States is unlikely. Economic interdependence and nuclear weapons are powerful, persuasive deterrents against it. However, Sino-American dealings, particularly in Taiwan or the South China Sea, provide instances in which the powder keg of Chinese nationalism could explode, effectively forcing party leadership into a series of irrational but irreversible actions. As such, the possibility of great-power war, unlimited or otherwise, cannot be ruled out. U.S. policymakers must plan accordingly.

**Turn – their argument increases the risk of war – failure to take security threats seriously causes destabilization, uncertainty, and conflict.**

**Doran 99** — Charles F. Doran, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), 1999 (“The Structural Turbulence of International Affairs,” *Survival*, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer, p. 148-149)

One of the characteristics of future major wars is that they will not necessarily look exactly like previous wars. Certainly the results have to be the same in terms of devastation and loss of life; otherwise they cannot be called 'wars'. But major war in fact may not last very long. It may happen very quickly, and, although it may be very intense, it may not involve as many of the major powers – though it probably would involve some of them.

What is frightening about this possibility, however, is that, as nuclear weapons proliferate, major wars may take place in areas where they would not previously have been expected: the Middle East for example. These new nuclear powers will possess relatively small nuclear forces for some time. They will still not have deterrent forces approaching second-strike capabilities. The populations and states in the region are relatively concentrated, and there is a history of surprise attack. Much of the proliferation is 'paired' between rivals, and it is very difficult for other states to control this dynamic, either in terms of the possible outbreak of war or in terms of the proliferation process itself.

The conclusion, then, is that the probability of major war declines for some states, but increases for others. And it is very difficult to argue that it has disappeared in any significant or reliable or hopeful sense. Moreover, a problem with arguing a position that might be described as utopian is that such arguments have policy implications. It is worrying that as a thesis about the obsolescence of major war becomes more compelling to more people, including presumably governments, the tendency will be to forget about the underlying problem, which is not war per se, but security. And by neglecting the underlying problem of security, the probability of war perversely increases: as governments fail to provide the kind of defence and security necessary to maintain deterrence, one opens up the possibility of new challenges. In this regard it is worth recalling one of Clausewitz's most important insights: A conqueror is always a lover of peace. He would like to make his entry into our state unopposed. That is the underlying dilemma when one argues that a major war is not likely to occur and, as a consequence, one

need not necessarily be so concerned about providing the defences that underlie security itself. History [end page 148] shows that surprise threats emerge and rapid destabilising efforts are made to try to provide that missing defence, and all of this contributes to the spiral of uncertainty that leads in the end to war.

**Effective decision-making is key – even if their argument is true, evaluating our impact is vital to prevent conflict.**

**Kagan 99** — Donald Kagan, Hillhouse Professor of History and Classics at Yale University, 1999 (“History Is Full Of Surprises,” *Survival*, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer, p. 140)

I agree that the present moment in history provides a better chance than ever for achieving a long period of peace, that the deterrent offered by nuclear weapons works towards that end, and that the growth of trade, democracy and economic interdependence assists that prospect. I do not, however, believe that war is obsolete – not yet, anyway. Nor do I believe that the present situation is unique in history any more than any moment is. As always, the chances for peace in the future depend on the decisions and the actions taken by people and these, as always, provide no guarantee against war – even 'major' war as Michael Mandelbaum has defined it.

**Overarching predictions about the future of international relations are usually wrong – the unpredictable nature of war means that you should err on the side of caution.**

**Kagan 99** — Donald Kagan, Hillhouse Professor of History and Classics at Yale University, 1999 (“History Is Full Of Surprises,” *Survival*, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer, p. 142)

But I would go further and would want to say even that very important concession is not sufficient, because the one great truth of history is that there is always one other possibility besides all the ones that you imagine, no matter how clever you are. What usually happens in history is in the category called 'none of the above'. If one examines the predictions made in the area of international relations over the centuries, most of the time, most of the people get it wrong – even the most learned, experienced and intelligent people. Without going into a long dissertation on chaos theory, it suffices that it has generally happened that wars break out in places where they were never imagined and often for reasons that were not to be anticipated.

**Just because states act rationally doesn't mean they'll make good decisions – imperfect information and intentional misinformation poison the decision-making process.**

**Mearsheimer 99** — John J. Mearsheimer, Whitney H. Shepardson Fellow at the Council on Foreign Relations and R. Wendell Harrison Distinguished Service Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago, 1999 (“Is Major War Obsolete?,” Great Debate Series between Professor Michael Mandelbaum and Professor John J. Mearsheimer, Presider: Mr. Fareed Zakaria, Council on Foreign Relations, February 25<sup>th</sup>, Available Online via Columbia International Affairs Online at <http://www.ciaonet.org/conf/cfr10/>, Accessed 03-21-2008)

The whole subject of rationality is a fascinating subject. I want to emphasize here that when I say states behave rationally, that doesn't mean that they can't then go out and make moves that produce catastrophes. The fact of the matter is that states behaving rationally oftentimes miscalculate and end

up shooting themselves in the foot. One very important aspect of international politics is the fact that when states make decisions, not only are they making those decisions based on imperfect information, but in many cases they are dealing with other states that are going to considerable lengths to fool them, to confuse them, to provide them with information that is incorrect misinformation. Because you're working with imperfect information and because you're oftentimes being confused by the adversary, you often times goof in a big way. I would make the argument just to highlight that when Hitler decided to invade the Soviet Union in June 1941, although it fortunately ended up with him shooting himself in a bunker in Berlin in April 1945, when he went into the Soviet Union, in my opinion, it was the result of a relatively rational decision-making process. They just miscalculated; they just guessed wrong.

## **2NC War Possible**

**The probability of major war is not zero – future wars will be more savage.**

**Doran 99** — Charles F. Doran, Andrew W. Mellon Professor of International Relations at Johns Hopkins University's Paul H. Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS), 1999 ("The Structural Turbulence of International Affairs," *Survival*, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer, p. 146-147)

The first reason for doubting the reality of this revolution concerns the tragedy of history. Pushing the analysis back to before what is sometimes described as the origin of the modern state system, there are at least five major wars to consider, beginning with the Thirty Year's War, then the wars of Louis XIV, the Napoleonic Wars and the twentieth century's two world wars. The tragedy is that five of these periods in fact tolerated wars that were truly massive. The Thirty Year's War was not only long but enormously destructive. In the German principalities, for example, it entailed the death of at least one of every three inhabitants. Parts of Bohemia did not recover their relative positions in terms of economic development until the twentieth century.

The origins of these wars were clearly in the changing structure of their respective international systems. These were periods when the tides of history, the relative power trajectories of states in the system, changed in a rapid and unpredictable way. Governments could not peacefully adjust to this rapid [end page 146] structural change. The end of the Cold War is the first time that a truly peaceful transformation of the system has ever occurred. One thing is certain: the underlying transformation of the structure of the international system will continue. There will be other junctures just as stressful for the international system as those in the past. So, any case for the obsolescence of major war must be found in the novelty of the response to this transformation, and in compelling evidence that the way of responding has changed permanently.

Michael Mandelbaum is right to identify two inter-related trends of warfare. On the one side there is a clear reduction in the probability of major war, largely because the costs have increased to such a degree; on the other side there is a clear, enormous increase in the destructive potential of major war. But Mandelbaum is less convincing in his interpretation of what this means. Because even though there has been a decline in the probability of war, including, perhaps, major war, the probability is still very much greater than zero. Yet, the only way you could really argue for the obsolescence of major war would be to say that the probability is virtually zero.

Mankind may have likewise learned to manage some kinds of force more prudently. Among mature democratic states, the incidence of war has surely decreased. But at the same time, warfare between democracies and non-democracies has not decreased at all. The magnitude of such wars may actually have increased since, for reasons of mass mobilisation and ideology, democracies tend to fight wars 'to end all war' – that is to say, savagely.

**Yes War, Recent Conflicts make it inevitable**

**Kaletsky, 14,** (Antole, correspondent for Maritime Executive, 6/21/14, <http://www.maritime-executive.com/article/First-War-Was-Impossible-Then-Inevitable-2014-06-27>)

Why does the assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand — the event that lit the fuse of World War One 100 years ago Saturday still resonate so powerfully? Virtually nobody believes World War Three will be triggered by recent military conflicts in Ukraine, Iraq or the China seas, yet many factors today mirror those that led to the catastrophe in Sarajevo on June

28, 1914. The pace of globalization was almost as dramatic and confusing in 1914 as it is today. Fear of random terrorism was also widespread. The black-hatted anarchist clutching a fizzing bomb was a cartoon cliché then just as the Islamic jihadist is today. Yet the crucial parallel may be the **complacent certainty that economic interdependence and prosperity had made war inconceivable**, at least in Europe. A 1910 best-selling book, *The Great Illusion*, used economic arguments to demonstrate that territorial conquest had become unprofitable, and therefore global capitalism had removed the risk of major wars. This view, broadly analogous to the modern factoid that there has never been a war between two countries with a MacDonald's outlet, became so well established that, less than a year before the Great War broke out, the Economist reassured its readers with an editorial titled "War Becomes Impossible in Civilized World." "The powerful bonds of commercial interest between ourselves and Germany," the Economist insisted, "have been immensely strengthened in recent years ... removing Germany from the list of our possible foes." The real "Great Illusion," of course, turned out to be the idea that economic self-interest made wars obsolete. Yet a variant of this naïve materialism has returned. It underlies, for example, **the Western foreign policy that presents economic sanctions on Russia or Iran as a substitute for political compromise or military intervention**. The truth, as the world discovered in 1914 and is re-discovering today in Ukraine, the Middle East and the China seas, is that **economic interests are swept aside once the genie of nationalist or religious militarism is released**. Russia has in past conflicts withstood economic losses unimaginable to politicians and diplomats in the Western world, and the same is true of Iran and China. **Thus the U.S. strategy of "escalating economic costs" cannot be expected to achieve major geopolitical objectives**, such as preserving Ukraine's borders or Japan's uninhabited islands. **Either territory must be open to renegotiation or the West must be prepared to fight to protect the "sanctity" of borders**, which shows the really unsettling parallels with the world of 1914. Though historians continue to debate World War One's proximate causes, two key destabilizing features of early 20th-century geopolitics created the necessary conditions for the sudden spiral into all-consuming conflict: the rise and fall of great powers, and the over-zealous observance of mutual-defense treaties. These features are now returning to destabilize geopolitics a century later.

## **Nuclear proliferation makes war possible – other countries don't care about MAD**

**Freedberg 13** (Sydney J. Freedberg Jr., the deputy editor for Breaking Defense and won awards from the association of Military Reporters & Editors, "No Longer Unthinkable: Should US Ready For 'Limited' Nuclear War?" Breaking Defense, 5-30-2013, <http://breakingdefense.com/2013/05/no-longer-unthinkable-should-us-ready-for-limited-nuclear-war/2/>, accessed 7-1-14)

For more than 60 years, most Americans have thought of nuclear weapons as an all-or-nothing game. The only way to win is not to play at all, we believed, because any use of nukes will lead to Armageddon. That may no longer be the game our opposition is playing. As nuclear weapons proliferate to places that might not share our reluctance to use them in small numbers, however, the US military may face a "second nuclear age" of retail Armageddon for which it is utterly unprepared.¶ Outside the US, both established and emerging nuclear powers increasingly see nuclear weapons as weapons that can be used in a controlled, limited, and strategically useful fashion, said Barry Watts, an analyst with the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, arguably the Pentagon's favorite thinktank. The Cold War "firebreaks" between conventional and nuclear conflict are breaking down, he wrote in a recent report. Russia has not only developed new, relatively low-yield tactical nukes but also routinely wargamed their use to stop both NATO and Chinese conventional forces should they overrun Moscow's feeble post-Soviet military, Watts said this morning at the headquarters of the Air Force Association. Pakistan is likewise developing tactical nukes to stop India's much larger military. Iran seeks nuclear weapons not only to offset Israel's but to deter and, in the last resort, fend off an American attempt to perform "regime change" in Tehran the way we did in Baghdad. The US Air Force and Navy concept of "AirSea Battle" in the Western Pacific could entail strikes on the Chinese mainland that might provoke a nuclear response.¶ It's precisely because US conventional power is so overwhelming that the temptation

to turn to nuclear weapons to redress the balance is so irresistible. Ten years ago, the Iraqis sidestepped American dominance in the middle of the spectrum of conflict – regular warfare with tanks, planes, and precision-guided non-nuclear weapons – by going low and waging guerrilla warfare, for which the US proved painfully unprepared. In the future, nuclear proliferation means more and more countries will have the option to sidestep US conventional power by going high and staging a “limited” nuclear attack, for which we aren’t really prepared either. Indeed, some countries, notably a nuclear Iran with its terrorist proxies and North Korea with its criminal ties and special operations forces, could outflank America’s conventional military from both sides at once.

## 2NC Yes War in SCS

**Rapidly increasing tension in the South China Sea echo the Gulf of Tonkin prior to the Vietnam War. Naval tensions high amongst new Chinese naval developments.**

**Eutaw, 6/25**

(<http://www.wallstreetdaily.com/2014/06/25/china-oil-rigs/> “The newest bully on the block? China” Christopher Eutaw, editor-in-chief for politics for the Wall Street Daily with years of experience in reporting anything political)

Lately, the news has been obsessed with two topics: Iraq and the Russia-Ukraine fiasco. In fact, we’re even guilty of it here, too. But in the midst of this media barrage, another important story just about slipped through the cracks... even though it has implications just as powerful as the stories getting more air time. You see, while ISIS has been conquering Iraq and Moscow has been bullying Kiev, China has been quietly flexing its muscle in the South China Sea. Specifically, the Chinese have been moving oil rigs into disputed territories and drilling for oil... all while ignoring the protests of the surrounding nations. And considering that a minor skirmish in the Gulf of Tonkin launched the Vietnam War, could China’s aggression possibly spark a new World War? Neighboring countries such as Vietnam and the Philippines have cited a 2002 accord between the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and China that created a nonbinding code of conduct, in order to “consolidate and develop the friendship and cooperation existing between their people and governments with the view to promoting a 21<sup>st</sup> century-oriented partnership of good neighbors and mutual trust.” But China’s aggressive moves directly violate the spirit of that code, even if it was nonbinding. In fact, the Chinese announced last Friday that they would be moving a second rig near Vietnam’s coastline, even though the two countries have yet to resolve a dispute over the first rig that China moved into territory that Vietnam calls its own. The dispute has sparked deadly riots in Vietnam – with protestors targeting Chinese factories – and has also created immense friction between the Chinese and Vietnamese navies. However, with China’s clear military and economic advantage, it’s doubtful that Vietnam could force China to move its rig. Meanwhile, most analysts believe that China’s aim is not just Vietnam’s territory, but in fact the majority of the South China Sea, a resource-rich area that *The New York Times* calls “a vital waterway for international commerce.” In recent years, China has been bolstering its navy in hopes of becoming a maritime super power, and the country now has three fleets, a class of nuclear submarines, and one aircraft carrier. In light of that information, the timing of China’s aggressive expansion in the region is probably not a coincidence. Between its newfound economic prosperity and its budding military, China sees an opportunity to outmuscle the much smaller countries that also share a border along the South China Sea. U.S. Defense Secretary, Chuck Hagel, said that “China has called the South China Sea ‘a sea of peace, friendship and co-operation,’ and that’s what it should be. But in recent months, China has undertaken destabilizing, unilateral actions asserting its claims in the South China Sea.” In fact, the country has been hard at work moving sand and rock into the Spratly archipelago – another contested region in the waterway – to create small islands on the shoals that could support military installations and surveillance equipment. That has caused speculation that China may, in fact, want to force the U.S. navy out of the South Pacific, a region it has dominated since World War II. At this point, it’s hard to tell what China’s end goal is. For the moment, it’s busy positioning oil rigs and searching for valuable resources. But the developments in the South China Sea are dubious, at best, and Obama must be watchful going forward.



## **2NC AT Democracy solves war**

**The march of democracy is not inevitable – history proves.**

**Kagan 99** — Donald Kagan, Hillhouse Professor of History and Classics at Yale University, 1999  
("History Is Full Of Surprises," *Survival*, Volume 41, Number 2, Summer, p. 142)

The same unpredictability applies to other associated historical trends: democracy, for example. When it was invented in Greece around 500BC, democracy really looked like the future. Athenian power became great and Athens became an attractive model. And a number of Greek states – certainly not the majority, but a great many – became democracies. If one lived, say, in 450 or even in 440BC, one might very well have made what would have been an intelligent prediction: that democracy was the road of the future.

Then the Athenians lost the Peloponnesian War, and democracy stopped. That was the end of democracy until the American Revolution. It is worthwhile remembering, therefore, that great historical reversals can happen. I don't argue that a comparable reversal will happen, and it would be a tragedy if it did, but we have to be alert to the possibility. Right now democratic systems have a great deal of appeal, partly on their own merits, but partly because they seem to be winning. And winning systems look great. But if you consider Europe in 1940, and ask yourself what people thought the future was in those days, the answer probably would not have been democracy. Then the Germans lost the war, and the future looked different.

## Counterplans

## **Australia CP**

## **1NC CP**

**Text: The Commonwealth of Australia should <INSERT PLAN TEXT>.**

### **Australia most reliable for oceans**

**Figgis, P. & Koss R. (Eds). (2012).** Conserving Australia's Marine Environment: Key Directions Statement. Australian Committee for IUCN, Sydney Conserving Australia's Marine Environment; [http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine\\_Statement\\_Web.pdf](http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine_Statement_Web.pdf)

Australia is a unique continent surrounded by a vast ocean territory containing biologically diverse ecosystems ¶ reliant on marine processes and interactions with the coastal environment. Australia's marine jurisdiction is the third ¶ largest on this planet, with our ocean territory larger than the size of our land. Complex systems of currents and ¶ diverse underwater seascapes stretch from the north's warm tropical waters to the cool waters in the south ¶ influenced by the Southern Ocean. We have the largest single coral reef system and the third largest mangrove area, ¶ with over half of the world's mangrove species and more than half of the world's seagrass species. Southern ¶ Australian marine systems are characterised by high levels of diversity and very high endemism - most species in ¶ the region are found nowhere else on the planet. These systems in turn support further outstanding marine species ¶ biodiversity including 4000 fish species - 20% of the world's total - six of the world's seven marine turtles and 45 of ¶ the known species of whales, dolphins and porpoises. ¶ Australians and the marine environment ¶ Australians have a special bond with their marine environment. Many Australian Indigenous communities have ¶ profound reliance on and responsibility for their Sea Country which provides spiritual, cultural, social and livelihood ¶ benefits to communities. ¶ With more than 85% of the Australian population living within 50 kilometers of a coastline 'the beach' is truly a ¶ uniting icon of most Australians. Beaches, bays, estuaries provides spaces for recreation, relaxation and ¶ connections with nature with strong cultural, social and heritage benefits. Marine wildlife is increasingly a source of ¶ fascination and a key tourism resource as people revel in the beauty of coral reefs and in the sight of whales, ¶ dolphins, sharks and turtles. As a result, the marine environment is intrinsic to the health and wellbeing of all ¶ Australians. As Australia's population grows, it will become increasingly reliant on the life-support services and ¶ associated health and well-being benefits supplied by our marine environment.

## 2NC Solvency

### **Australia key to international cooperation**

**Figgis, P. & Koss R. (Eds). (2012).** Conserving Australia's Marine Environment: Key Directions Statement. Australian Committee for IUCN, Sydney Conserving Australia's Marine Environment; [http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine\\_Statement\\_Web.pdf](http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine_Statement_Web.pdf)

The Australian government has recognised the importance of engaging in marine conservation at the regional and international level. To this end it supports international conventions such as the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources and makes representation at conferences such as the recent 2012 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20). This support extends to international marine collaborations via regional agreements, programs and summits including: the United Nations Environment Program, the World Bank Global Partnership for Oceans, the Coral Triangle Initiative, the East Asia Summit, and the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Program Pacific Oceanscape program.

### **Empirics prove- Australia solves MPAs better**

**Figgis, P. & Koss R. (Eds). (2012).** Conserving Australia's Marine Environment: Key Directions Statement. Australian Committee for IUCN, Sydney Conserving Australia's Marine Environment; [http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine\\_Statement\\_Web.pdf](http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine_Statement_Web.pdf)

Australia's marine environment is in relatively good condition compared with many other nations. One of our aims as a nation should be to maintain this state and ensure that the deterioration seen in the Australia's land and freshwater systems since European settlement is not repeated in our oceans. Avoiding deterioration of our marine environment is a significant challenge in light of the shifts in natural systems caused by human induced climate change. To face this challenge, it is essential that the trajectory of conservation is forward - towards increased protection, ecologically sustainable use of resources and much better management of threatening processes. We should also move beyond any notion of Australia's marine environment as simply protecting discrete areas while the larger marine environment is left unprotected. This will not be sufficient for its long term conservation. Rather, our vision should be all encompassing - conservation and ecologically sustainable use across the entire Australian marine environment. For this vision to be met, Australia needs to reflect the challenges and actions outlined in this Statement within the nation's policy, planning and decision-making processed across all jurisdictions and portfolios.

### **Australia is key to leading environmental ocean policies**

**Figgis, P. & Koss R. (Eds). (2012).** Conserving Australia's Marine Environment: Key Directions Statement. Australian Committee for IUCN, Sydney Conserving Australia's Marine Environment; [http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine\\_Statement\\_Web.pdf](http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine_Statement_Web.pdf)

Beyond our territorial waters and EEZ Australia has made international commitments and contributions to marine conservation through signing on to international conventions, engaging in international marine policy through conferences such as Rio+20 and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) as well as collaborating in regional agreements, programs and summits such as the Coral Triangle Initiative. The Australian Government also uses such international policies to guide its national marine agenda, notably with the recent establishment of the NRSMPA. Australia's leadership in marine conservation must continue to guide best-practice marine policy. This is vitally important to the global efforts to restore the earth's largest ecosystem but also very important to our regional policies. Most of Australia's near neighbours are nations reliant on their marine-based livelihoods. The following are specific international priority actions that should be taken by the Australian Government:

- support the Global Ocean Commission in formulating effective global marine conservation measures.
- enhance the sustainability of commercial fisheries by:
  - o contributing to a greater global commitment to reduce fishery capacities within the oceans to avoid overfishing.
  - o taking a stronger and broader approach to address issues of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing including international collaboration through relevant conventions and agreements.
- protect the High Seas by reaffirming the commitment to establish an implementing agreement for the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as a mechanism for high seas governance in areas beyond national jurisdiction (such as establishing high seas MPAs and increasing compliance of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (UNCSD, 2012).
- meet the challenge of deep-sea mining by:
  - o supporting the establishment of a global moratorium that bans deep-sea mining consistent with the precautionary approach in the absence of a current understanding of the environmental implications of such mining.
  - o supporting increased priority being given to mapping biodiversity values prior to exploration of the seabed.
  - o increasing communication with the International Seabed Authority.
- embrace and encourage a broader adoption of the ecosystem-based marine management approach of the Antarctic Treaty System as a mechanism to shift away from sector-based management.

This approach requires science-based performance standards for protection of ecological systems and for monitoring.

- formally integrate blue carbon and coastal ecosystems into guidelines of the Coastal Resilience Program for AusAID in relation to climate change adaptation and mitigation.
- enhance integrated bioregional marine planning by:
  - o working to improve integrated bioregional marine planning with our international neighbors including Indonesia, Timor Leste and Papua New Guinea to address trans-boundary issues in shared shallow waters that contain near pristine, tropical ecosystems.
  - o accessing and using Australia's leading marine science expertise and the expertise and interests of key marine stakeholders, to inform effective and holistic international marine policy development and planning.

## AT Perms

### **Perm fails: Australia is key to leading environmental ocean policies- jurisdiction key**

**Figgis, P. & Koss R. (Eds). (2012).** Conserving Australia's Marine Environment: Key Directions Statement. Australian Committee for IUCN, Sydney  
Conserving Australia's Marine Environment;  
[http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine\\_Statement\\_Web.pdf](http://aciucn.org.au/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/Marine_Statement_Web.pdf)

Beyond our territorial waters and EEZ Australia has made international commitments and contributions to marine conservation through signing on to international conventions, engaging in international marine policy through conferences such as Rio+20 and the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) as well as collaborating in regional agreements, programs and summits such as the Coral Triangle Initiative. The Australian Government also uses such international policies to guide its national marine agenda, notably with the recent establishment of the NRSMPA. Australia's leadership in marine conservation must continue to guide best-practice marine policy. This is vitally important to the global efforts to restore the earth's largest ecosystem but also very important to our regional policies. Most of Australia's near neighbours are nations reliant on their marine-based livelihoods. The following are specific international priority actions that should be taken by the Australian Government:

- support the Global Ocean Commission in formulating effective global marine conservation measures.
- enhance the sustainability of commercial fisheries by:
  - o contributing to a greater global commitment to reduce fishery capacities within the oceans to avoid overfishing.
  - o taking a stronger and broader approach to address issues of illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing including international collaboration through relevant conventions and agreements.
- protect the High Seas by reaffirming the commitment to establish an implementing agreement for the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as a mechanism for high seas governance in areas beyond national jurisdiction (such as establishing high seas MPAs and increasing compliance of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (UNCSD, 2012).
- meet the challenge of deep-sea mining by:
  - o supporting the establishment of a global moratorium that bans deep-sea mining consistent with the precautionary approach in the absence of a current understanding of the environmental implications of such mining.
  - o supporting increased priority being given to mapping biodiversity values prior to exploration of the seabed.
  - o increasing communication with the International Seabed Authority.
- embrace and encourage a broader adoption of the ecosystem-based marine management approach of the Antarctic Treaty System as a mechanism to shift away from sector-based management. This approach requires science-based performance standards for protection of ecological systems and for monitoring.
- formally integrate blue carbon and coastal ecosystems into guidelines of the Coastal Resilience Program for AusAID in relation to climate change adaptation and mitigation.
- enhance integrated bioregional marine planning by:
  - o working to improve integrated bioregional marine planning with our international neighbors including Indonesia, Timor Leste and Papua New Guinea to address trans-boundary issues in shared shallow waters that contain near pristine, tropical ecosystems.
  - o accessing and using Australia's leading marine science expertise and the expertise and interests of key marine stakeholders, to inform effective and holistic international marine policy development and planning.

### **Perm Fails: Australian hotspots are key, U.S does not have the jurisdiction to implement reserves**

### **Perm fails: Australian leadership key to international cooperation. U.S is not apart of already determined committees**

## **China CP**



## **1NC Text**

**Text: The People's Republic of China should <INSERT PLAN TEXT>.**

## Solvency Card

**China solves – they have the enforcement, government framework, and experience to establish Marine reserves**

**Dang, Professor at Schulich School of Law, 14** [Vu Hai, 2/16/14, Marine Protected Areas

Network in the South China Sea, Library of Congress,

[http://books.google.com/books?id=i122AgAAQBAJ&pg=PA166&lpg=PA166&dq=china+marine+reserves&source=bl&ots=BOFEXP\\_GMv&sig=EV9FVgve5LPW8yj3rnKEv\\_3syK8&hl=en&sa=X&ei=oP-3U6\\_\\_L4XMsQS\\_p4HgDg&ved=0CG0Q6AEwCA#v=onepage&q=china%20marine%20reserves&f=false](http://books.google.com/books?id=i122AgAAQBAJ&pg=PA166&lpg=PA166&dq=china+marine+reserves&source=bl&ots=BOFEXP_GMv&sig=EV9FVgve5LPW8yj3rnKEv_3syK8&hl=en&sa=X&ei=oP-3U6__L4XMsQS_p4HgDg&ved=0CG0Q6AEwCA#v=onepage&q=china%20marine%20reserves&f=false), accessed 7/5/14]

The Standards on Categorizing Marine Nature Reserves, adopted by the State Oceanic Administration in 1998, define basic principles for classifying marine nature reserves in China.” According to these Standards, marine nature reserves are classified according to functional categories or importance level.” Marine nature reserves can also be divided into national, provincial, prefectural and county levels, depending on, inter alia. Whether an area has an international, national, or local significance? A system of point attribution was also set up to determine which level a marine nature reserve would belong to. Besides, specific types of marine nature reserves could be adopted by different government authorities within their scope of authority, such as the nature reserve for the protection of aquatic animals and plants, 39 nature reserves for the protection of forests and potentially nature reserves for the protection of coastal wetlands under the developing wetlands protection regulations.” Special Marine Reserves are regulated by the Measures for the Administration of Special Marine Reserves, adopted by the State Oceanic Administration in 2010.” Based on the geographical location, resources, environmental conditions, the status of exploitation of marine resources and socio-economic development needs, the special marine reserve can be classified as a marine special geographical conditions reserve, marine ecological reserve, national park, natural monument, habitat, species management area, protected landscape/seascape, managed resource area and other types of areas. Special marine reserves are also designated at national and local levels. “Unlike marine reserves which use a zone-based approach for exploitation management, marine special reserves use an activity-based approach. Certain activities are prohibited inside a marine special reserve, namely hunting, mining, bird egg picking, cutting of mangroves, dredging in coral reef areas; fishing using electricity; direct discharges of pollutants into the sea; unauthorized acquisition, processing and marketing of wildlife and mineral products; removing, defacing and damaging the areas’ facilities. Other activities, such as ecological aquaculture, artificial breeding of marine species, eco-tourism, leisure fishing, scientific experiments, education and public awareness, are allowed under strict conditions. The conditions to be respected include the control of the tourist flow and the use of healthy farming techniques for aquaculture. The violation of the Measures is subject to an administrative line that goes from 10,000 to 10,000,000 Reminbi yuan and the obligation to repair the damage caused.” At the central level, the State Oceanic Administration is in charge of the overall supervision and management of special marine reserves in the country. Specifically, it adopts plans for the development of national special marine reserves and supervising their implementation. The Administration establishes and directly manages national marine special reserves located outside the territorial seas and provides guidance on the establishment and development of local special marine reserves.” At the local level, departments in charge of ocean affairs at the provincial level establish and manage national special marine reserves

within their jurisdictions in accordance with the development plan for national marine special reserves. They provide planning for the establishment and development of local level marine special reserves and supervise the implementation of the plan. County-level governments are in charge of establishing and managing local marine special reserves according to the plan set up by provincial governments. "Special funds for the planning, establishment and management of marine special areas must be established by local governments" above the county level and national marine special areas could receive subsidies from the Special Funds for National Marine Ecological Protection managed by the State Oceanic Administration." According to the State Oceanic Administration, up to 2011, China established more than 200 nature reserves and marine special reserves at all levels, covering an area of over 3.3 million hectares or 1.12 percent of the total jurisdictional waters claimed by China. "More than thirty of those designated MPAs are located in the four provinces of China bordering the SCS. Among them, 14 are national marine nature reserves; six are national special marine reserves (marine parks) and 4 are provincial marine nature reserves. According to Google Map, all these MPAs seem to be located in the near-shore areas of the SCS"

## **Norway CP**

## **1NC Text**

**Text: The Kingdom of Norway should <INSERT PLAN TEXT>.**

## Solvency Cards

### **Norway can do the plan already enforcing marine reserves**

Directorate of Fisheries, 9, (2/3/9, <http://www.fiskeridir.no/english/fisheries/marine-protected-areas>)

The Norwegian fisheries management regime is aiming at maximizing the long term sustainable yield of the living marine resources and at the same time protecting biodiversity and the functioning of ecosystems. To achieve this goal a comprehensive set of management measures has been developed over the last several decades, including a complex **variety of MPAs** as defined by IUCN. The management regime and its accompanying measures are dynamic and developing. Some of the area based measures may originally have been introduced for other reasons than **protecting biodiversity**, i.e. protection of small scale static gear fisheries from the competition of large scale trawlers. Still, such an area has in fact enjoyed, maybe for decades, a higher protection than its surroundings. Area based management measures have so far been introduced to Norwegian fisheries management. Pursuant to this Act the Ministry of Fisheries and Coastal Affairs has laid down detailed provisions in the regulations relating to seawater fisheries. The regulation is frequently updated, and attached to it are maps showing a substantial number of, but by far not all, marine areas protected by Norwegian fisheries legislation. Since 2004 extensive management measures have gradually been introduced to rebuild the stock of Norwegian coastal cod. Coastal cod and arctic cod mix on the fishing grounds in fjords and coastal waters. A core element of the management plan is to push the fleet fishing for cod out from the coast; the larger the vessel the further out it has to move. Detailed provisions excluding specific fleet groups and gears from areas inside fjords (fjord lines), the baseline, 4 or 6 nm respectively, are laid down in the annual Regulation of the cod, haddock and saithe fisheries north of 62° N.

### **Programs already in place, Norway already working**

Arctic Council, 11, (4/5/11, <http://www.arctic-council.org/index.php/en/arctic-contaminants-action-program-acap>)

The Arctic Contaminants Action Program (ACAP) is one of the six Working Groups of the Arctic Council which was formally given working group status at the Arctic Council Ministerial Meeting in Salekhard, Russia in October 2006. Prior to that, ACAP had operated as a steering committee called the Arctic Council Action Plan to Eliminate Pollution in the Arctic with a mandate to increase efforts to limit and reduce emissions of pollutants into the environment and promote international cooperation. The goal of ACAP continues to be to reduce emissions of pollutants into the environment in order to reduce the identified pollution risks. ACAP also encourages national actions for Arctic State governments to take remedial and preventive actions relating to contaminants and other releases of pollutants. ACAP acts as a strengthening and supporting mechanism to encourage national actions to reduce emissions and other releases of pollutants. The Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) is the biodiversity working group of the Arctic Council, and its mandate is to address the conservation of Arctic biodiversity, and to communicate its findings to the governments and residents of the Arctic, helping to promote practices which ensure the sustainability of the Arctic's living resources. CAFF's projects provide data for informed decision making in resolving the challenges which are now arising in trying to both conserve the natural environment and permit regional growth. This work is based upon cooperation between all Arctic countries, indigenous organizations, international conventions, and organizations.

### **Norway taking first steps to create MPA double of Obama's**

Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition, 13, (7/10/13, <http://www.asoc.org/news-and-publications/publications/888-will-norway-protect-the-antarctic-ocean>)

Norway joins 23 countries and the EU in a vote that should see the creation of the world's largest marine reserve, and doubling of the protection of earth's oceans, and the protection of large areas of the southern ocean surrounding Antarctica, home to penguins, seals, sea birds, orcas and unique species of fish. The commission for the conservation of Antarctic marine living resources (ccamlr) will hold a special meeting in Bremerhaven, Germany on July 15th and 16th to consider just two things: proposals to designate large marine protected areas in the Ross Sea and along east Antarctica's coast. Norway will chair the meeting, but is sending no senior officials; else Berit Eikeland, who recently took over

delegation leadership from Karsten Klepshvik, will apparently not attend. And Norway's position on whether it will support the consensus required to successfully establish the reserves is currently unclear. A positive decision in Bremerhaven would turn 1.6 million km<sup>2</sup> of the pristine Ross Sea and 1.9 million km<sup>2</sup> of East Antarctica's waters into marine protected areas, closed to commercial fishing and other industries. UN countries are committed to protecting 10 percent of the world's oceans by 2020, yet we have achieved just 1%. The Bremerhaven vote is the fastest route to 10 percent.

## Norway already protecting 17% of its Ocean

State of Environment Norway, 13 (4/1/13, <http://www.environment.no/Topics/Biological-diversity/Protected-areas/>)

The degradation and fragmentation of habitats is the greatest threat to biodiversity in Norway. By establishing national parks and other protected areas, we can safeguard threatened and vulnerable habitats and areas of international, national or regional importance. The Convention on Biological Diversity is the global agreement on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. At the Nagoya summit in 2010, the world's countries agreed on new goals – the Aichi targets – to be achieved by 2020. These include ensuring the effective conservation of ecologically representative areas covering at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas. Almost 17 per cent of mainland Norway is now protected under the Nature Diversity Act. A large proportion of this consists of mountainous areas. A number of other habitat types, such as those in coastal and marine habitats, are not yet adequately represented. Coastal waters within the baseline around mainland Norway cover an area of 90 000 km<sup>2</sup>, but only about 2 900 km<sup>2</sup> of this is protected. Norway has an international responsibility to safeguard a representative selection of fjord and coastal areas of types that are hardly found anywhere else in the world. One of the national parks includes skerries off the coast, but fjords are very poorly represented. In addition, Norway has designated the island of Jan Mayen north-east of Iceland as a nature reserve. The reserve includes a marine area of approximately 4 315 km<sup>2</sup> around the island. A much higher proportion of Svalbard than of mainland Norway is protected, including large marine areas. National parks and nature reserves are protected under the 2002 Svalbard Environmental Protection Act. Altogether, they cover 65 per cent of the area of the islands and about 87 per cent of the territorial waters out to the 12-nautical-mile territorial limit. Continued fragmentation and development of areas of natural habitat will have a negative impact on biological diversity. There is a risk that important habitat types will disappear altogether. Future generations may have more restricted opportunities for sustainable use of biological diversity and for experiencing Norway's natural riches than we do today.

# **United Kingdom CP**

## **\*\*Note\*\***

This is probably best run in conjunction with a basic politics disad. The idea here is that having the United Kingdom do the plan in the Pitcairn Islands not only solves for massive biodiversity in an increasingly threatened region, but, more importantly, doesn't link to the massive political struggles seen by Obama after his allocation of water around Hawaii for a Marine Protected Area. Obama used an executive order to allocate this land, leading to massive political infighting which is completely avoided if the plan is passed.

You aren't going to win that the Pitcairn Islands are more ecologically biodiverse than Hawaii, because, like, that's totally not true. However, if you can win that it avoids tearing US politics to shreds and hurting Obama's political capital, then you can very easily win with this CP.



## 1NC Shell

**Text: The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland should designate its Exclusive Economic Zone around the Pitcairn Islands as a “No Take Marine Reserve” and increase marine protection around its territories in the Pacific Ocean.**

**The UK’s territory in the Pacific Ocean is incredibly biodiverse and rich in unique life. Protecting the areas around the Islands is critical.**

**BBC, Jan 15 2014**

(<http://www.bbc.com/news/uk-politics-25751537> “UK ‘not protecting’ Biodiversity in overseas territories”)

The Environmental Audit Committee said the UK was responsible for endangered species and significant habitats in 14 locations, including Bermuda, Anguilla Gibraltar and the Falkland Islands. But these had not been fully "assessed and catalogued", and the UK's approach was based on "vague aspirations". **Wildlife groups say the government must significantly raise spending in them.** According to the committee, the 14 overseas territories for which the UK is responsible contain vast tracts of ocean, thousands of coral atolls, tropical forests and a polar wilderness six times the size of the UK. They contain at least 517 globally threatened species as well as undisturbed habitats of international significance. But the MPs warn that these are at risk of "immediate and significant threats" from invasive species, under-regulated development and climate change. **We believe the government must heed this warning now and take the action necessary to protect the territories' unique wildlife** Dr. Tim Stowe RSPB Although the UK had sub-contracted environmental management to the authorities in the inhabited territories, the committee said this "cannot devolve away the UK's ultimate responsibility under international law". It is calling on ministers to work with local officials on the islands concerned to promote sustainable tourism and planning regimes. **"The natural environment in the overseas territories is incredibly diverse, but it is currently under-protected,"** Joan Walley, the Labour MP who chairs the body, said. "The UK government doesn't even know precisely what it is responsible for, because it has failed accurately to assess and catalogue those species and habitats." **In particular, she said, the UK must back the 50 inhabitants of the Pitcairn Islands in their efforts to establish a fully marine-protected area around the islands.** She added: "During our inquiry, the UK government expressed vague aspirations to 'cherish' the environment in the overseas territories, but it was unwilling to acknowledge or to address its responsibilities under United Nations treaties. "Although it is prepared to exercise hard and soft power in relation to financial matters in the territories, the UK government is apparently not prepared to exercise those powers to protect biodiversity and to promote environmental sustainability." The 14 territories - Anguilla; Bermuda; British Antarctic Territory; British Indian Ocean Territory; Cayman Islands; the Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in Cyprus; Falkland Islands; Gibraltar; Montserrat; Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands (known as Pitcairn Islands); St Helena, Ascension and Tristan da Cunha; South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands; Turks and Caicos Islands; and British Virgin Islands - have a combined population of about 250,000. The Royal Society for the Protection of Birds has estimated the UK needs to spend £16m a year over five years to protect the wildlife of the territories, against the £1.5m it spent last year. **"We believe the government must heed this warning now and take the action necessary to protect the territories' unique wildlife and play its part in curbing the current global extinction crisis,"** said its international director, Dr Tim Stowe. The UK concludes international treaties on the territories' behalf and is ultimately responsible if they violate a treaty obligation. The UK is a signatory to the UN Convention on Biological Diversity, which sets out the actions that countries must take to protect species and ecosystems.

**The UK overseas territories in the Pitcairn Islands are some of the most biodiverse regions in the Pacific. Residents are committed to protection but the parliament must be convinced.**

**CNN, 12**

(<http://www.cnn.com/2012/12/04/world/asia/pitcairn-marine-bounty/> "Protecting Pitcairn's marine bounty")

The Pitcairn Islands might only have 55 human inhabitants, but the waters surrounding them are teeming with marine life. A new study by the Pew Environment Group in partnership with the National Geographic Society has revealed the glorious extent of the biodiversity in this remote corner of the South Pacific. A team of scientists led by marine ecologist Enric Sala completed more than 450 dives at 97 locations earlier this year as well as lowering cameras down to depths of 1,600 meters in a further 17 spots. Along with more than 250 species of fish, 70 species of coral and more than 60 varieties of algae were observed around the four islands (Pitcairn, Henderson, Oeno and Ducie) that make up the British Overseas Territory. To date, nearly 1,250 marine species (including seabirds) have been found in the area, but scientists believe many more remain undiscovered. "Unless we change our relationship with the sea, we will inevitably bear witness to its collapse. Given its "unique and pristine" environment, the expedition report recommends turning the Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) -- an area extending 200 nautical miles from a territory's coast -- around Pitcairn into a "no-take" marine reserve. "There are only a handful of EEZs of the world that remain pristine occupying less than 5% of the ocean," the report says. "These places allow us to know what the ocean was like before heavy human impacts ... and most important, to set proper conservation and management goals for our oceans. "Should the UK government back the plan, the reserve would become the largest of its kind in the world, covering an area of more than 800,000 square kilometers (300,000 square miles), according to the Pew Environment Group. The proposals have received the enthusiastic backing of the Pitcairn islanders, whose tiny population includes a direct descendant of Fletcher Christian -- leader of the mutineers on HMS Bounty who settled on the island in 1790. A National Geographic documentary about the expedition -- "Pitcairn: The Real Bounty Revealed" -- recently premiered at the headquarters of the UK's Royal Society in London. Speaking at the event, Pew Environment Group managing director, Josh Reichert said that until recently it was widely believed that the oceans were too vast and abundant to be impacted by humans. "We now know this is not true. Unless we change our relationship with the sea, we will inevitably bear witness to its collapse," Reichert said.

### **\*\*Note\*\***

The following card is awesome if they have a biodiversity/warming advantage. It basically says that protecting the Pitcairn Islands is a critical prerequisite to protecting the rest of the world because it provides unique insight into pristine ocean. The argument is made that the Pitcairn Islands are like a "Time Machine" allowing us to go back and see what unmolested reef habitats look like. This, you can argue, is absolutely critical because you cannot protect with the intent of restoring a marine environment (or for that matter any environment) if you don't know to what state you intend to return it.

**The Pitcairn Islands are critical to our understanding of the ocean. They provide valuable insight into future protection.**

**Friedlander et al, 14**

(<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0100142> “The Real Bounty: Marine Biodiversity in the Pitcairn Islands” Friedlander AM, Caselle JE, Ballesteros E, Brown EK, Turchik A, et al. Friedlander works at the university of Hawaii with the departments of Coral Reef Community Ecology, Fisheries Science, Marine Conservation Biology, and Traditional Marine Resource Use and Management

Because of the nearly pristine and unique nature of most marine ecosystems of the Pitcairn Islands, its EEZ has a unique global value that is irreplaceable. There are only a handful of areas in the EEZs of the world that remain pristine, occupying probably less than 5% of the ocean [83]. These places allow us to envision what the ocean was like before heavy human impacts, to understand what we have lost in other places because of human impacts, and most importantly, to set proper conservation and management goals for our oceans [23]–[24]. Pitcairn islands and the surrounding EEZ are currently being considered for protection in what would be the largest marine reserve in the world, containing approximately 836,000 km<sup>2</sup>. In September 2012, the Pitcairn community unanimously agreed to support the creation of a marine reserve, and in January 2013 a joint proposal was submitted to the UK Government for consideration. If protection of this area proceeds, scientific research and monitoring will be established. This study, as the first to quantitatively assess the community structure of the organisms inhabiting the coral reefs on the Pitcairn islands, will provide a valuable baseline by which future changes in ecosystem components can be measured.

## 2NC UK Key

**Immediate protection is necessary in the region. Pitcairn Islands are key to biodiversity and only the UK can solve.**

**BBC, June 26 2014**

(<http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-28022031> "Immediate protection' needed for Pitcairn's marine bounty"  
Matt McGrath is the environment correspondent for BBC news, having reported on numerous environmental issues. He cites a survey done by Dr. Enric Sala, who is a National Geographic explorer-in-residence actively engaged in exploration, research, and communications to advance ocean conservation)

Researchers say that "immediate protection" is required for the waters around the remote Pitcairn Islands in the Pacific, home to one of the world's rarest and most valuable collections of marine species. The waters have "unique global value that is irreplaceable" says the report, from an international team of scientists. They've carried out the first underwater surveys of the deep and shallow waters around the islands, best known for their connection to the mutiny on the Royal Navy ship, Bounty, in the 18th century. Some of the mutineers settled on Pitcairn and around 50 of their descendants still live there, governed as a British overseas territory. People know about the mutiny on the Bounty but the true bounty of the Pitcairn's is underwater" Dr Enric Sala, National Geographic Society. The four islands in the group lie halfway between New Zealand and South America. They are said to be further from a continent than any other inhabited island. The extremely remote location has prevented prior scientific exploration of the unsullied waters. "It is a treasure trove of marine species," Dr Enric Sala told BBC News. "People know about the mutiny on the Bounty but the true bounty of the Pitcairn's is underwater. "The scientists found healthy coral reefs and an abundance of fish, around half of them not found anywhere else in the world. A key indicator of the water's good state were the number of top predators like sharks that the scientists recorded. They accounted for over half of the biomass at Ducie Atoll, one of the least disturbed locations. Perhaps the most significant discovery was down to the purity of the water. The scientists found a type of coralline algae living deeper than anywhere else on earth. "It lives at 382m that's more than 100m deeper than the previous record, because of the clarity of the water," said Dr Sala. "It also allows coral reefs to grow to depths that are incredible elsewhere, we found well developed reefs between 75 and 100m below the surface. "The remoteness of the islands has been critical in preserving the waters but the scientists saw some evidence of the encroachment of illegal shark fishing, carried out by foreign fleets. They argue that plans to turn the islands into one of the world's biggest marine reserves should go ahead as soon as is practicable. The islanders have voted in favour of this approach and a plan has been submitted to the UK government to create a 836,000 sq km protected zone around the islands. The plan is still being considered by the UK, but it has been boosted in recent weeks with the announcement that the United States is to declare a huge reserve around the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument. The scientists say the time is right for the Pitcairns to follow suit. "These islands are like a time machine, that allow us to get back hundreds of years to see what we have lost," said Dr Sala. "But we can also to determine what we want for the future."

## No Link (Generic Disads)

**UK will pass, just needs prompting. Counterplan is popular amongst island natives, relative to unpopular protection around immediate UK territory.**

Or

**Counterplan is a better investment, expected to boost revenues from tourism at minimal cost.**

Or

**Doesn't link to the fishing industry DA, already scarce fishing in the region outside of illegal fishing, fishing only accounts for 30k a year.**

### **Economist, 13**

(<http://www.economist.com/news/asia/21588420-south-pacific-about-get-worlds-biggest-national-park-pitcairns-bounty>  
"Pitcairn's bounty" )

ON LAND, nature reserves are ten a penny. About one-sixth of the earth's land surface is protected in one way or another. Reserves at sea are much scarcer, covering, at most, 3%. But a proposal to designate the Exclusive Economic Zone around the Pitcairn islands in the South Pacific as a marine protected area (MPA) may help redress the balance. The British dependency of Pitcairn (population, 65) is home to descendants of the Bounty mutineers. The idea of a reserve, promoted by the American-based Pew Charitable Trusts, is to ban fishing in 830,000 square km (320,000 square miles) of sea around Pitcairn. The immediate cost to Pitcairn's economy would be trivial: some \$30,000 in license fees for tuna fishing forgone each year. In return the world's smallest democracy would not only enjoy the kudos of having the world's biggest MPA, but also hope to draw tourists. The Great Barrier Reef is reckoned to bring in about \$4 billion for Australia each year. Hopes are high that the British government will endorse the idea. Pitcairn relies on annual British subsidies equivalent to £50,000 (\$81,000) per inhabitant. And the MPA plan is broadly welcomed by islanders. Simon Young, Pitcairn's deputy mayor, says it has "always been a seafaring nation, protective of its marine environment". If Britain enacted legislation for the reserve, it would not face local opposition as it did when it designated a reserve around the Chagos archipelago in the Indian Ocean in 2010. Locals had been forced out in the late 1960s and early 1970s to make way for an American base; the reserve was seen as another way to stop them ever returning. The Pitcairn islands could scarcely be more remote, with New Zealand 4,800km (3,000 miles) to the west and Ecuador 6,000km to the east. Arguably, this isolation prevents overfishing. The worst overfishing takes place in what Peter Jones, a geographer, calls "metropolitan seas" near larger populations. It is, he says, politically easier to designate an MPA in a remote area than where fisheries are heavily used. Britain's struggle to create significant MPAs around its own coast underlines the point.

**\*\*INSERT CARD SAYING SOLVING FOR PITCAIRN KEY TO GLOBAL PROTECTION, ALLOWS FOR BETTER PROTECTION. MEANS NO LINK TO WARMING/BIODIVERSITY LOSS\*\***

## A2: US Reserves Better

### **Plan incredibly unpopular, means political infighting and massive hits to local economies.**

**Eilperin, June 17 2014**

([http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-will-propose-vast-expansion-of-pacific-ocean-marine-sanctuary/2014/06/16/f8689972-f0c6-11e3-bf76-447a5df6411f\\_story.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/obama-will-propose-vast-expansion-of-pacific-ocean-marine-sanctuary/2014/06/16/f8689972-f0c6-11e3-bf76-447a5df6411f_story.html)) “Obama proposes vast expansion of Pacific Ocean sanctuaries for marine life” Juliet Eilperin joined The Washington Post as the House of Representatives reporter, where she covered the impeachment of Bill Clinton, lobbying, legislation, and four national congressional campaigns. Since April of 2004 she has covered the environment for the national desk, reporting on science, policy and politics in areas including climate change, oceans, and air quality.

President Obama announced Tuesday his intent to make a broad swath of the central Pacific Ocean off-limits to fishing, energy exploration and other activities. The proposal, slated to go into effect later this year after a comment period, could create the world’s largest marine sanctuary and double the area of ocean globally that is fully protected. “I’m going to use my authority to protect some of our nation’s most precious marine landscapes,” Obama said in a video to participants at a State Department conference, adding that while the ocean is being degraded, “We cannot afford to let that happen. That’s why the United States is leading the fight to protect our oceans.” The announcement — first reported earlier Tuesday by The Washington Post — is part of a broader push on maritime issues by an administration that has generally favored other environmental priorities. The oceans effort, led by Secretary of State John F. Kerry and White House counselor John D. Podesta, is likely to spark a new political battle with Republicans over the scope of Obama’s executive powers. The president will also direct federal agencies to develop a comprehensive program aimed at combating seafood fraud and the global black-market fish trade. In addition, the administration finalized a rule last week allowing the public to nominate new marine sanctuaries off U.S. coasts and in the Great Lakes. Obama has used his executive authority 11 times to safeguard areas on land, but scientists and activists have been pressing him to do the same for untouched underwater regions. President George W. Bush holds the record for creating U.S. marine monuments, declaring four during his second term, including the one that Obama plans to expand. Under the proposal, according to two independent analyses, the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument would be expanded from almost 87,000 square miles to nearly 782,000 square miles — all of it adjacent to seven islands and atolls controlled by the United States. The designation would include waters up to 200 nautical miles offshore from the territories. “It’s the closest thing I’ve seen to the pristine ocean,” said Enric Sala, a National Geographic explorer-in-residence who has researched the area’s reefs and atolls since 2005. Obama has faced criticism from a variety of groups — including cattle ranchers, law enforcement officers and ATV enthusiasts — over his expansion of protections for federal lands. The ocean area under consideration, by contrast, encompasses uninhabited islands in a remote region with sparse economic activity. Even so, the designation is expected to face objections from the U.S. tuna fleet that operates in the region. Fish caught in the area account for up to 3 percent of the annual U.S. tuna catch in the western and central Pacific, according to the Pew Charitable Trusts. When Bush created the monument in 2009, he exempted sport fishing to address industry opposition. Mike Leonard, ocean resource policy director for the American Sportfishing Association, said recreational fishing enthusiasts would push to ensure their existing exemption stays in place if the protected area is expanded. “We believe in almost all instances you can still have marine conservation and marine protection, and still allow for sustainable recreational fishing activities to take place,” Leonard said, adding there’s almost no sportfishing activity in the area because “it’s a heck of a trek out there. Our concern is obviously with the precedent this might set.”

\*\*\* (if they are using my 2AC blocks this also has the added benefit of being from one of their authors, which is nice) \*\*\*

**Their own plan says that making these areas “No-Take Marine Reserves” is critical to their solvency. Either they concede that they don’t ban all fishing in the region, in which case they cannot access their solvency, or they don’t allow fishing in which case they link hard to (fishing industry, politics)**



## **A2: Perm**

Politics and the fishing disads serve to answer the perm

## **Disadvantages**

## **Politics DA**

## 1NC Link

**Recent Obama XO solves the aff but it's massively unpopular with the GOP and fishing groups – continued debate in Congress sets a precedent which triggers the link – this evidence assumes their uniqueness trick**

**Golden 6-23** [Abigail, the Daily Beast, 6-23-14, "Republicans: Obama's Ocean Protection Plan Evidence of 'Imperial Presidency'," <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/06/23/republicans-obama-s-ocean-protection-plan-evidence-of-imperial-presidency.html>] WD

President Obama announced last week that he plans to add massive amounts of territory to the Remote Pacific Islands National Marine Monument, a tract of ocean surrounding seven hard-to-reach islands and atolls in the south-central Pacific Ocean. Obama's decision will expand the original reserve, created by George W. Bush in the last days of his presidency, by almost five times its original size. The expanded national monument will quintuple the number of seamounts, or underwater mountains, under federal protection, and close almost 780,000 square miles of ocean to tuna fishing. Obama's decision has been hailed for its conservation impact by scientists and even by the New York Times editorial board. Gareth Williams, a researcher at Scripps who studies the coral reefs within the reserve, hailed the expanded national monument as protecting some of the most intact natural areas left on the planet. "It's almost impossible to find another example of that, forests included," Williams told The Daily Beast. "There are always examples of degradation, but there are very few examples of ecosystems left that are that pristine." But plenty of people aren't happy with Obama's decision, and the next few months—in which the exact details of the expansion will be up for review—may be contentious ones. These are the groups that have most at stake in opposing the expanded Remote Pacific Islands reserve:

1. Republican lawmakers Obama's use of an executive order to establish the reserve expansion angered Republicans in government, who viewed it as an attempt to test the limits of White House authority. Congressman Doc Hastings (R-Wash.), the chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, was quick to denounce Obama as an "Imperial President" who is "intent on taking unilateral action, behind closed doors, to impose new regulations and layers of restrictive red-tape." By Hastings' standards, another candidate for an "imperial presidency" would be George W. Bush, who created four marine national monuments during his time in office. By Hastings' standards, then, another candidate for an "imperial presidency" would be George W. Bush, who created four marine national monuments during his time in office, totaling some 300,000 square miles of protected ocean.
2. The commercial fishing industry. Currently, about 3 percent of the U.S.' tuna catch in the western and southern Pacific comes from the area now under protection, according to Pew Charitable Trusts. Congressman Hastings has criticized Obama for closing this area to tuna fishing, cautioning that this move will "make the U.S. tuna fleet even less viable, meaning that in the not-too-distant future all of America's tuna will be caught by foreign vessels." Paul Dalzell, a senior scientist with the Western and Central Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Council, echoed this industry-centric approach. "The islands [in the reserve] already have 50-nautical-mile boundaries around them to protect all the coral reef and shallow water habitats, so they're more than adequately protected already," Dalzell told The Daily Beast. But for migratory species like tuna, he argues, large-scale ocean reserves have little conservation value, since tuna simply swim beyond the boundaries of the closed areas to be caught by other fleets. The reserve "has no major conservation benefits, will penalize U.S. fishermen, and there's no net gain," Dalzell continued. It's worth noting that Pew Charitable Trusts, which works on ocean conservation issues, has condemned the Western and Central Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Council for its poor fisheries practices, which it claims are hastening overfishing in the Pacific region.
3. Recreational fishers. After Bush first established the Remote Pacific Islands reserve in 2009, the American Sportfishing Association successfully petitioned for a recreational fishing exemption within the

reserve. Now the group, which represents manufacturers of fishing tackle rather than sport fishermen themselves, **plans to push for the exemption to apply throughout the expanded area.** “We believe in almost all instances you can still have marine conservation and make sure that your fisheries resources are in good, healthy condition, and still allow some recreational fishing to take place,” **Mike Leonard, a spokesperson for the ASA,** told The Daily Beast. **The group’s** insistence on a recreational fishing exemption is mostly academic, since the areas within the expanded reserve are so remote as to be unreachable to sport fishermen. Williams, who has traveled to the reserve repeatedly for his research, said that he has never seen a recreational fishing boat there. But Leonard **claims that the reserve could set a precedent for the federal government closing more high-use areas to sport fishing.** **“It seems to be a growing trend that,** when you add it up nationally, can be one of those death-by-a-thousand-cuts issues, where **you continue to close off areas one by one,”** he told the Beast. **“Cumulatively that can have a major impact, from a national standpoint, for the entirety of the recreational fishing and boating industry.”** Of course, marine reserves won’t keep fishermen from enjoying protected natural spaces—just from using the expensive fishing tackle that the ASA’s members sell.

## **Fishing Industry DA**

## 1NC

### **U.S. fisheries are recovering now**

Plumer 14 (Brad, Senior Editor at Vox, "How the US stopped its fisheries from collapsing," 5/8/2014, <http://www.vox.com/2014/5/8/5669120/how-the-us-stopped-its-fisheries-from-collapsing/CH>)

We hear a lot of grim stories about overfishing and the decline of fisheries around the world. Bluefin tuna is vanishing. Chilean sea bass is dwindling. Pretty soon, it sometimes seems like, all that'll be left is the jellyfish. So **it's worth highlighting a country that has actually done a lot to curtail overfishing and rebuild its fisheries** in the past decade — **the United States**. Back in the 1980s and '90s, many fisheries in the US were in serious trouble. Fish populations were dropping sharply. Some of New England's best-known groundfish stocks — including flounder, cod, and haddock — had collapsed, costing the region's coastal communities hundreds of millions of dollars. But **the picture has improved considerably in the last decade**, thanks in part to stricter fishing regulations. Last week, **the** National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (**NOAA**) **released its annual fisheries update for 2013 — and the news was encouraging**. Yes, progress has been uneven. About one-fifth of assessed stocks are still overfished. But **on the whole, US fisheries are steadily recovering**.

### **The plan hurts a large portion of the fishing industry**

Juliet **Elperin 14** (Writer for the Washington Post. "Pacific fishing interests oppose Obama's plan to expand marine reserve." June 30, 2014. <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/post-politics/wp/2014/06/30/pacific-fishing-interests-oppose-obamas-plan-to-expand-marine-reserve/CH>)

When President Obama announced two weeks ago he intended to expand federal protections around seven islands and atolls in the central Pacific Ocean, many environmentalists hailed the move as an important step for conservation. But **the main group overseeing fishing operators** in Hawaii and three U.S. territories in the region declared Monday it **opposes the proposal, on the grounds that it would hurt the U.S. fishing industry**. The Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council—composed of fishing industry representatives as well as some state and federal officials—helps establish fishing policy for both commercial and recreational operators in Hawaii as well as the territories of American Samoa and Guam, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. In a statement released Monday afternoon, **members** of the quasi-governmental agency **said** they would oppose any additional limits on commercial fishing in the area. President George W. Bush used his executive authority to establish the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument, which now encompasses almost 87,000 square miles, in 2009. Obama is now contemplating widening those boundaries to cover nearly 782,000 square miles of federal waters, which would be off-limits to fishing, energy exploration and other activities. Right now the designation extends 50 miles out from shore; it could be extended as far out as 200 miles from shore around each of the U.S. territories. The statement, which was approved by the council's executive committee, argues **this broad expansion would deprive American fishing operators of an important resource. "U.S. fishermen, including those in the Pacific, already abide by the strictest fishing regulations in the world, and this plan further inhibits their economic survival,"** they wrote, adding it would yield "few, if any, ecological benefits from the restrictions."

### **Strong fishing industry key to the global economy**

**Dyck and Sumalia 10** (Andrew, Fisheries Economist at the University of British Columbia and Rashid, Professor and Director of the Fisheries Economics Research Unit at UBC Fisheries Centre. "Marine Fisheries and the World Economy." 2010.

[http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:TD46RDfMoHMJ:www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/News/Press\\_Releases/Protecting\\_ocean\\_life/Pew%2520OSS%2520World%2520Economy%2520FINAL.pdf+&cd=19&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=safari/CH](http://webcache.googleusercontent.com/search?q=cache:TD46RDfMoHMJ:www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/News/Press_Releases/Protecting_ocean_life/Pew%2520OSS%2520World%2520Economy%2520FINAL.pdf+&cd=19&hl=en&ct=clnk&gl=us&client=safari/CH)

OCEAN SCIENCE SERIES **The total economic impact of fisheries is nearly three times larger than the landed value. People in coastal countries depend on healthy fisheries for their livelihoods.** Gross revenue globally from marine fisheries has been estimated during the last decade at \$80 billion to \$85 billion\* annually. This estimate, however, reflects only the landed, or market, value of the fish as they first leave the boat, and it underestimates the full economic impact of fisheries. A more accurate accounting of the value of the fishing industry to the global economy would incorporate the indirect effects on related industries that depend on well-managed fisheries. Andrew Dyck and his co-author, Rashid Sumaila, of the University of British Columbia, estimated the total global economic activity supported by marine fisheries (i.e., non-aquaculture, ocean fisheries). They found that **by considering the economic impacts of fisheries on other sectors such as boat manufacturing or canning industries, the total global value is approximately \$240 billion annually,** as calculated from 2003 data—nearly three times the landed value. The authors concluded that **considering only the direct value of fisheries underestimates the true economic impact of marine fisheries worldwide.** This Pew Ocean Science Series report is a summary of the scientists' findings.

## Global economic decline risks nuclear war.

### Merlini '11

[Cesare Merlini, nonresident senior fellow at the Center on the United States and Europe and chairman of the Board of Trustees of the Italian Institute for International Affairs (IIA) in Rome. He served as IIA president from 1979 to 2001. Until 2009, he also occupied the position of executive vice chairman of the Council for the United States and Italy, which he co-founded in 1983. His areas of expertise include transatlantic relations, European integration and nuclear non-proliferation, with particular focus on nuclear science and technology. A Post-Secular World? DOI: 10.1080/00396338.2011.571015 Article Requests: Order Reprints : Request Permissions Published in: journal Survival, Volume 53, Issue 2 April 2011 , pages 117 - 130 Publication Frequency: 6 issues per year Download PDF Download PDF (~357 KB) View Related Articles To cite this Article: Merlini, Cesare 'A Post-Secular World?', Survival, 53:2, 117 – 130]

Two neatly opposed **scenarios for the future of the world order illustrate** the range of **possibilities,** albeit at the risk of oversimplification. The first scenario entails the premature crumbling of the post-Westphalian system. **One or more of the acute tensions apparent today evolves into an open** and traditional **conflict between states, perhaps** even **involving the use of nuclear weapons. The crisis might be triggered by a collapse of the global economic and financial system, the vulnerability of which we have just experienced,** and the prospect of a second Great Depression, **with consequences for peace** and democracy **similar to those of the first.** Whatever the trigger, the **unlimited exercise of national sovereignty, exclusive self-interest and rejection of outside interference would likely be amplified,** emptying, perhaps entirely, the half-full glass of multilateralism, including the UN and the European Union. Many of the more likely conflicts, such as between Israel and Iran or India and Pakistan, have potential religious dimensions. Short of war, tensions such as those related to immigration might become unbearable. Familiar issues of creed and identity could be exacerbated. One way or another, the secular rational approach would be sidestepped by a return to theocratic absolutes, competing or converging with secular absolutes such as unbridled nationalism.



## **2NC Uniqueness**

**Fish species once decimated by overfishing are now rebuilding-current management solves**

**Handwerk '13** [2-28-14, Brian Handwerk is a regular contributor for National Geographic, "Once Decimated U.S. Fish Stocks Enjoy Big Bounce Back,"

<http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2013/03/130326-fish-stocks-rebound-fisheries-management/>, HR]

Two-thirds of the closely monitored U.S. fish species once devastated by overfishing have bounced back in a big way thanks to management plans instituted 10 to 15 years ago, a new study says. And fish aren't the only ones celebrating. Recovering populations can mean more revenue and jobs for some fishermen—but unfortunately success hasn't been universal. Authors of a new Natural Resources Defense Council report said the results prove that critically overfished species can be rebuilt, even from very low levels, when Mother Nature is given a chance to recover. That's good news in a world where rampant overfishing is a critical concern. "This demonstrates that when we trace the historic arch of these fisheries in which rebuilding requirements were put in place 15 years ago, we see real positive news. We see populations that were depleted or in decline turned around and rebuilt or well on their way to rebuilding," said principal author Brad Sewell. "It's not 100 percent. It's two-thirds, so it's not unbridled good news but it does show the effectiveness of a law that has had its share of controversy," he added. The study used in-depth stock assessments and other data from NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service to chart the progress of stocks managed under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. That law was revamped by Congress in 1996, in an attempt to address plunging fish populations around America's coastlines, mandating that stocks be rebuilt within a decade (some were granted exceptions). The NRDC report charts progress for the 44 stocks that have sufficient population and catch data under the act and found nearly two-thirds, some 28 stocks, have now been designated as fully rebuilt or as having made significant progress toward sustainable populations. The study doesn't include species not managed under Magnuson-Stevens, those for which recent stock assessments aren't available, or those fished internationally.

**Law enforcement is causing depleted stocks to recover in the status quo.**

**Wines '13** [3-15-13, Michael Wines has a graduate degree in journalism from Columbia University and is a New York Times staffwriter based in Beijing, "Fish Populations in the United States Rebound," <http://www.nytimes.com/2013/03/16/science/earth/fish-populations-in-us-rebound-since-1996-catch-limits-law.html>, HR]

Many commercial fishing stocks off the United States coast that were depleted by decades of overfishing are returning to abundance, thanks largely to a 1996 law that effectively ordered limits on catches until the fish populations had rebounded, a newly released analysis of federal data on fish populations states. The analysis, by the Natural Resources Defense Council, concludes that 21 of 44 species that it studied have met rebuilding targets and 7 others have made significant progress, increasing their populations by at least 25 percent. Sixteen have made less or no progress, the report stated, including 10 species off the New England coast, most of them

popular bottom-dwelling fish like cod and flounder. In half of those cases, the fish populations had grown by more than 25 percent but were still being overfished. All have been managed under the 1996 law, the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, which sets a 10-year target for rebuilding each species. Brad Sewell, a lawyer for the resources group and the main author of the analysis, said the uptick in fish populations was especially impressive in light of what he called a dismal record in most other parts of the world. "When you look at the population trajectories of dozens and dozens of stocks, you see '96 as a real watershed," he said. "You see this cause and effect between implementing the law and the upward population trajectory."

## 2NC AT Catch Shares

### **Catch shares don't solve the industry- if anything they hurt it**

**SSF 2014** (Saving Seafood, "NOAA Fisheries Releases Fisheries Economics of the U.S. 2012 and Status of the Stocks 2013 Reports." April 29, 2014. <http://www.savingseafood.org/fishing-industry-alerts/noaa-fisheries-releases-fisheries-economics-of-the-u.s.-2012-and-status-of-the-stocks-2013-rep-2.html/CH>)

WASHINGTON (Saving Seafood) April 29, 2014 -- Today, NOAA Fisheries released the 2012 edition of its annual economic report on the state of U.S. fisheries, "Fisheries Economics of the U.S. 2012," alongside the 2013 edition of its annual "Status of the Stocks." According to NOAA, the two reports "show strong economic gains from fishing, continued improvement in fish stocks." However, as many in New England already know, **growth and improvement haven't been felt everywhere. Strict catch limits** and sector management **have contributed to a decline in** the region's working **waterfronts**. NOAA's economic report states, "**The key performance indicators of** [the Northeast Multispecies Sectors or "**Catch Share**"] program **show that** since implementation from 2010 through 2011, **total revenue**, quota and landings of groundfish **decreased** while total revenue per active vessel and total revenue per trip increased."

## 2NC Links

### **The plan uniquely devastates the US fishing industry despite sustainable status quo fishing practices**

**WP Council, 6/30**

[Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, "Obama Administration's Proposed Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument Expansion Betrays US Fishermen, Places Unfair Burden on US Pacific Islands", June 30, 2014, <http://www.wpcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/FINAL-WPRFMC-Reaction-to-Proposed-PRIMNM.pdf> , ML]

On June 17, 2014, at the Our Oceans Conference held at the State Department in Washington, DC, President Obama announced his intent to use Presidential authority to "preserve and protect the ocean." The White House's press release clarifies that the Administration will immediately consider expansion of the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument.<sup>ii</sup> Further details on what the public and US fishermen in the Pacific Islands might expect are in the May 20, 2014, report to the United States government "Expansion of the U.S. Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument: The largest ocean legacy on Earth," accessible on the Marine Conservation Institute website.<sup>iii</sup> The report recommends that the current monument encompassing 50 nautical miles (nm) around the seven US Pacific Remote Islands be expanded to the full extent of the US 200-nm exclusive economic zone (EEZ). President **Obama's** continued aspiration for a strong legacy concerning environmental issues is commendable, but **his plan for the US Pacific Islands unfairly penalizes the US fishermen** and seafood consumers who depend on this resource. US fishermen, including those in the Pacific, already abide by the strictest fishing regulations in the world, and this plan further inhibits their economic survival. For example, the proposal will result in a tenfold increase in US waters from which US fishermen are banned and disproportionately burdens fishermen in the US Pacific Islands. To ensure their continued survival and because these changes will do little for conservation, the US government should allow US fishermen continued access to the US EEZ around the existing 0- 50 nm Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument. The Obama Administration's proposed monument expansion joins **a lengthy list of historical restrictions** on US Pacific Island fishermen. In 2006, President George W. Bush used the Antiquities Act, a power created in 1906 for the President to declare areas of US land to be national monuments, to establish the first-ever marine national monument. It spans 140,000 square miles of waters surrounding the Hawaiian Islands.<sup>iv</sup> Its establishment **shut down federally managed US fisheries that supplied Hawaii with nearly 50 percent of its bottomfish** by restricting US fishermen from their traditional fishing grounds in the US EEZ around the remote Hawaiian Islands. These restrictions led to increased foreign fish imports into Hawaii, the loss of livelihood for US fishermen, and the displacement of other US fishermen. In 2009, President Bush used the same Act to establish three more marine monuments where commercial fishing is banned.<sup>v</sup> Creation of the existing monuments in the US Pacific Islands also included many broken promises. For example, when the monument in the Hawaiian Islands was developed, native Hawaiians <sup>2</sup> were told they could continue traditional fishing there. However, once the monument was established, fishermen were prohibited from bringing their catch home to their families and community, as was customary. When the Marianas Trench Marine Monument was created, promises such as millions of dollars in revenue, a visitors' center and co-management promised by the Pew Environment Group and James Connaughton from the White House's Council on Environmental Quality were left unfilled. The US commercial fishing industry operating in the US EEZ around the US

Pacific Islands is already strictly regulated by federal and international measures ranging from restrictions on gear types to allowable locations. Only two fish stocks are overfished. The first is the ground seamount stock at Hancock Seamount, which was depleted by foreign fishing prior to establishment of the US EEZ and which is under a moratorium. The second overfished stock was announced just this year, the West Central North Pacific striped marlin, which is highly migratory and subject to international fishery management. Likewise, there is only one stock experiencing overfishing in waters around the US Pacific Islands, the bigeye tuna, which is also highly migratory and subject to international management measures. The “overfished” designation relates to the status of the stock. Overfishing indicates that a fishery under its existing catch and effort is unsustainable over the long-term, and could lead to an overfished stock. Given the highly migratory nature of the stocks and international nature of these fisheries and the management of them, further reductions on US fishing opportunities in US waters are unnecessary and will only cause harm to our nation. The existing Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument encompasses 77,020 square miles (199,500 km<sup>2</sup>) of US waters around Kingman Reef, Palmyra Atoll, Howland Island, Baker Island, Jarvis Island, Johnston Atoll and Wake Island. These are the waters located 0-50 nautical miles (nm) from shore. At Howland Island, Baker Island, Jarvis Island, Palmyra Atoll, and Kingman Reef the terrestrial areas, reefs and waters out to 12 nautical miles (22 km; 14 mi) (radius) are further protected as part of the National Wildlife Refuge System. Coral reefs, near-shore habitats and deepwater precious corals are well protected through these designations. Commercial fishing is banned, and recreational fishing is allowed only at Palmyra, operated by the National Wildlife Refuge in partnership with The Nature Conservancy. Commercial fishing by US fishermen is the only existing activity that would be affected by the monument expansion. Foreign fishing vessels do not operate in the US EEZ around the Pacific Remote Islands nor for that matter in US waters around any other Pacific Island, including American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI), Guam and Hawaii. Foreign fishing in these waters would require a Pacific Insular Areas Fishing Agreement (PIAFA). Since the creation of the US EEZ in 1976, no such agreement has been made. US fishermen in the Pacific Islands have to observe no-take areas in the monuments and additional fishing areas closed due to designated National Marine Sanctuary expansions, such as Aunu'u in American Samoa. They also have to contend with myriad military zones including Pearl Harbor and Barking Sands in Hawaii, the northern two-thirds of the island of Guam plus its southern banks, and the waters around the islands of Tinian and Farallon de Medinilla, and around prepositioning vessel sites off Saipan in the CNMI. Pagan is being proposed as another militarized closed area. These closed areas, along with state and territorial marine protected areas and reserves, as well as fishing areas inaccessible due to currents and inclement weather (islands typically have calm waters on one side and rough waters on the other) have resulted in fishermen being forced into more dangerous waters and increased injuries and drownings of American fishermen. By comparison, federally restricted fishing zones developed through a public process take into account safety-at-sea and other national standards of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSA). With the four marine monuments in place, the US Pacific Islands account for 90 percent of the nation's marine protected areas in size of area protected and 95 percent of the nation's marine protected areas that do not allow commercial fishing. If the Pacific Remote Islands Monument were to be expanded to the 200-mile EEZ, 67 percent of the US EEZ in the Pacific Islands would be closed to US commercial fishermen.

**IMPACT OF EXPANSION** Given these factors, the expansion of the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument will negatively impact the US fishing economy by overstepping currently managed sustainable management regimes, reducing US fisheries competitiveness, and yielding few, if any,

ecological benefits from the restrictions. Successful US Fishing Regulations Disregarded US commercial fisheries operating in US waters around the Pacific Islands are already well regulated and monitored to ensure conservation and management of fish stocks, habitat and the ecosystem. Fishermen operating in the waters around the Pacific Remote Islands include US longline vessels targeting bigeye and yellowfin tuna for the US fresh fish markets (with fish kept on ice and not put in freezers) and US purse seine vessels targeting skipjack for tuna canneries, such as those that make up the primary economy of American Samoa. These fishing operations are based in Hawaii, American Samoa and California and are managed federally through the MSA, among other federal regulations. They also abide by the international conservation and management measures of the Western and Central Pacific Fisheries Commission (WCPFC) and the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission, both of which the United States is a treaty member. These US vessels adhere to numerous regulations including, but not limited to, annual catch quotas, vessel monitoring systems, observer coverage (i.e., observers placed onboard to monitor catches and compliance with regulations, including potential protected species interactions), protected species workshops, mandatory protected species release gear, restricted vessel size of 101 feet for longline vessels, and restricted fleet size (Hawaii longline fleet capped at 164 with actual size at about 140 vessels). In the White House's press release, the President proclaimed "the health of our ocean is under threat on multiple fronts, from overfishing to carbon pollution." Expanding the Monument and restricting US fishermen from US waters will not mitigate these threats. US fisheries already operate under annual catch and effort limits and numerous other federal and international regulations. John Podesta, described by the Washington Post as "the man behind President Obama's new environmental push" told conferees at the Capitol Hill Ocean Week in Washington, DC on June 10, "Because of [the] MSA [Magnuson-Stevens Act] reforms...we have largely ended overfishing in federally managed waters and we're rebuilding fish stocks at unprecedented rates in much of our country...I want to emphasize what a tremendous accomplishment that is ..." US vessels are highly monitored, strictly regulated and enforced by the Regional Fishery Management Councils, National Marine Fisheries Service and US Coast Guard (USCG). The waters around the Pacific Remote Islands Marine Monument are equally important to US fishermen and to the nation. As noted in the publication of the USCG's Protecting America's Fisheries, "With its great distance from the mainland, it is easy to ignore issues that are specific to the region." Many Americans are unaware that Honolulu consistently ranks within the top ten commercial fishing ports in the US by value landed. The President also acknowledged that US fisheries management is ending overfishing and rebuilding fish stocks. Limiting US fishermen from their nation's waters and disregarding the spectacular success of many management measures already being implemented does not best serve US fishermen.

## **The plan hurts US fishers – gives greater advantage to foreign fishers**

### **WP Council, 6/30**

[Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, "Obama Administration's Proposed Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument Expansion Betrays US Fishermen, Places Unfair Burden on US Pacific Islands", June 30, 2014, <http://www.wpcouncil.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/FINAL-WPRFMC-Reaction-to-Proposed-PRIMNM.pdf> , ML]

US Fisheries Lose Foreign Competitive Advantage In its press release, the White House acknowledges that "Americans all over the country depend on the ocean for food, jobs and recreation," but speaks little of the foreign trade dimensions of this issue. About 90 percent of the seafood consumed in the

United States is imported from foreign countries and results in a nearly \$11 billion seafood trade deficit. Banning US fishermen from nearly a million square miles of US waters will only exacerbate this situation, keeping Americans from domestically produced seafood and jobs. The US purse-seine fleet is currently facing record license fees under the South Pacific Tuna Treaty, which is negotiated by the US Department of State. This means that the US Pacific Remote Islands offer needed, accessible fishing areas, especially for US seiners that operate out of American Samoa and predominately in the central Pacific. American Samoa's limited economy is highly dependent on the tuna processing industry, and any negative impacts to the US tuna vessels that operate out of American Samoa will likewise have a negative impact on the American Samoa economy. The US EEZ around Palmyra outside of 50 nm is fished by the Hawaiian longline fleet. It is an important area for Hawaiian fishing vessels targeting bigeye tuna without competition from foreign fleets. As much as 12 percent of the annual Hawaiian longline catch has been produced out of the EEZ around Palmyra, according to the National Marine Fisheries Service. There is significant fishing effort by the Hawaiian longline fleet around Johnston as well. Bigeye tuna stocks in the Western and Central Pacific Ocean are predicted to shift eastward as a result of climate change impacts<sup>vii</sup>. US longline fishermen will be unable to access bigeye stocks in the equatorial US Pacific Remote Islands waters if these are completely closed to fishing. It imposes a disadvantage relative to other Pacific Island nations that will keep their EEZs open to fishing. Because US fishing vessels are equipped with vessel monitoring systems (VMSs) and closely monitored by the National Marine Fisheries Service and United States Coast Guard, a monument expansion would prohibit their entry into US waters while foreign vessels, which are not required to have VMS on the high seas, could illegally operate in our waters. Without the presence of US fishing vessels to act as sentinels, illegal foreign fishing is likely to increase<sup>viii</sup>. Such a scenario is a betrayal to US fishermen in the US Pacific Islands. Hawaiian longline fishermen will not be allowed to fish the US EEZ around the Pacific Remote Islands. However, foreign and domestic purse seine vessels can fish these waters indirectly by deploying fish aggregation devices (FADS), which are not required to be marked. Charles Daxboeck, Chair of the Scientific and Statistical Committee that advises the Western Pacific Regional Fisheries Management Council (WPRFMC), notes that such foreign fishermen can deploy FADS on the high seas adjacent to the PRIA EEZs, with the intention that these FADS will drift through the PRIA EEZs accumulating fish as they go, to be fished in the high seas on the other side.

## **The plan devastates the fishing industry despite decreasing trends of overfishing WP Council, 6/30**

[Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, "Press Release – Obama Administration's Proposed Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument Expansion Betrays US Fishermen, Places Unfair Burden on US Pacific Islands", June 30, 2014, <http://www.wpcouncil.org/author/wpcouncil/>, ML]

The voting members of the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council (WPRFMC) from the State of Hawaii, Territories of American Samoa and Guam and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands have analyzed the Obama Administration's newly announced plan to expand the Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument. They have determined that it would provide no added conservation benefit to marine resources, but will economically harm the area's fishermen and those reliant on Pacific marine resources. Noting that the President himself has declared that the United States "has largely ended overfishing in federally managed waters," the Council members are urging the



Administration to continue allowing US fishermen into these areas. According to the WPRFMC, the Administration failed to consult the WPRFMC about the true economic and environmental impacts of its plan to expand the Monument. The WPRFMC also recommends modifications to the Antiquities Act to prevent similar such unilateral declarations in the future, which override existing fisheries management statutes, such as the Magnuson-Steven Fishery Conservation and Management Act. The June 17 announcement, made at the Our Oceans Conference hosted at the State Department, would enlarge the current Pacific Remote Islands Marine National Monument—established by President Bush in 2009—to encompass the full 200-nautical-mile Exclusive Economic Zone of seven US Pacific Island Possessions. However, the Council counters in its report that this expansion will ultimately be ineffective in reaching the Obama Administration's stated goal of combatting threats to the ocean's health, like overfishing and ocean acidification caused by greenhouse gas pollution. US fisheries are already required by the Magnuson-Stevens Act to eliminate overfishing, and the US boasts the strongest, most conservation-minded fisheries management in the world. Fishermen in the region are already subject to catch limits, vessel monitoring, observer requirements, and gear restrictions to ensure that they do not overfish the species they target nor endanger other species in the process. The President's plan aims to aid marine species like tuna, seabirds, coral reefs, and sharks, but, according to the WPRFMC, it disregards the effective management plans already in place. Because the region's fish are highly migratory, the Council views the current, more focused international management approach as the most effective move to achieve the Administration's stated goals, and that the Marine Monuments are superfluous in stopping overfishing. The value of consulting regional management and local merchants in fisheries management is emphasized by the same Administration that announced this sweeping Executive plan. John Podesta, described by the Washington Post as "the man behind President Obama's new environmental push" has said, "Responsible fishery management grounded in strong science and reinforced by strong partnerships between the fishing, conservation, and science communities is crucial for the economic health of fishing communities and the country as a whole." Weighed against any prospective environmental benefit is the serious economic cost to Western Pacific fisheries and fishing communities. The areas covered by the Marine Monument are important for the region's longline and purse seine fisheries, which were already pushed out of valuable fishing grounds with the original 2009 Pacific Islands Remote Marine Monument designation. Expanding the monuments will sever local fishermen's access to these resources and in turn strain the island communities that depend on the Pacific for their livelihoods. For this reason, the Council urges the Administration to continue to allow US fishermen into these areas.

## **Reserves devastate the fishing industry**

**Duffy**, environmental reporter for ABC, **12**

[Conor, ABC News, "World's largest marine reserve network unveiled", November 15, 2012, <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2012-06-14/burke-announces-marine-parks-reserve/4069532>, ML]

But the plan has drawn fire from commercial and recreational fishers, who say it goes too far, and from the Greens, who say it does not go far enough. Opposition Leader Tony Abbott says he is "instinctively against" anything which impinges on the rights of recreational fishermen. And he expressed caution about the plan's potential impact on tourism and on commercial fishing operations. We're going to lose access to a very benign fishery that we can supply local fresh product to the community. That's going to be taken away not just from us, it's going to be taken away from the community. Fremantle commercial



fisherman Clayton Nelson "We know from this Government's record that they can't be trusted to get the consultation right, they can't be trusted to get the implementation right, and often enough they can't even be trusted to get the science right," he said. Fremantle-based commercial fisherman Clayton Nelson employs 20 people and said **new marine parks** in his area **would see him lose about 35 per cent of his business**. "We're going to have to review how we do our business, how we go forward," he said. "It's not a good day for us, I can't hide from that. "We're going to lose access to a very benign fishery that we can supply local fresh product to the community. "That's going to be taken away not just from us, it's going to be taken away from the community." Dean Logan from the Australian Marine Alliance said the plan would hurt commercial fishers. "It's basically saying to Australians you cannot be trusted to be good custodians of the environment," he said. Professional prawn fishing groups says the marine park reserves will have a severe impact on the prawn industry in northern Australia. Austral Fisheries general manager Andy Prendergast says the **marine reserves**, particularly in the Gulf of Carpentaria, **will exclude them from their most important fishing grounds** for Tiger and Banana prawns. He says the decision could effectively wipe out Australia's free-range prawn fishing industry. "There is a tipping point," he said. "If we can't get access to these areas, **that could effectively put us out of business in time**." The Amateur Fisherman's Association of the Northern Territory says the park network will affect commercial fisheries more than recreational anglers.

## **The plan hurts US fishers while making US waters more susceptible to foreign fishers Hawaii Free Press, 6/17**

["Rep Hastings: Obama's Ocean Zoning Will Shut Down Tuna Fishery", June 17, 2014,  
<http://www.hawaiifreepress.com/ArticlesMain/tabid/56/ID/12898/Rep-Hastings-Obamas-Ocean-Zoning-Will-Shut-Down-Tuna-Fishery.aspx>, ML]

WASHINGTON, D.C., June 17, 2014 - House Natural Resources Committee Chairman Doc Hastings (WA-04) released the following statement regarding President Obama's announcement of overreaching Executive action to unilaterally lock-up huge portions of the Pacific Ocean: "For years the Obama Administration has threatened to impose ocean zoning to shut down our oceans, and today the President is making good on that threat. This is yet another example of how an Imperial President is intent on taking unilateral action, behind closed doors, to impose new regulations and layers of restrictive red-tape. Oceans, like our federal lands, are intended to be multiple-use and open for a wide range of economic activities that includes fishing, recreation, conservation, and energy production. It appears this Administration will use whatever authorities – real or made-up – to close our ocean and coastal areas with blatant disregard for possible economic consequences. **"This Administration is creating an unworkable patchwork of management regimes that will hurt our economy and further strain our enforcement capabilities.** The State Department just completed negotiating several science-based international fishery management agreements in the Pacific and is working on changes to an existing international agreement to allow U.S. tuna boats to have access to waters in the South Pacific. This announcement undercuts all of that work and will likely make the U.S. tuna fleet even less viable, meaning in the not-too-distant future **all of America's tuna will be caught by foreign vessels.**" Link: Printable PDF of this Document \* \* \* \* \* Scientist: Obama Plan has no conservation benefit other than to penalize US fishermen HNN: **Expanding the marine preserve** out Western would mean including areas around the deepest point of the ocean, the Marianas Trench, near the island of Guam. But it **would** also **push into areas where** Hawaii's long liners and other **U.S. fishermen fish** near Johnston atoll, Palmyra

Island as well as Jarvis and Holland. "It has no conservation benefit other than to penalize U.S. fishermen," said Paul Dalzelle, senior scientist for the Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council. Scientists of the council met in Honolulu Tuesday. It was a prelude to next week's full council meeting which will include members from Guam and Samoa. It is expected to take a strong position against the marine preserve plan. Members argue that expanding the no-fishing zone is not only bad for business, but will not help tuna and sharks that migrate. "There are already 50 nautical-mile closures around those areas. It's called part of the marine national monument. They are already protecting the coral reefs, all the near shore fish, precious corals, coral reef fish and sharks pushing out to the 200 nautical miles. It will have no major conservation benefit," said Dalzelle. The council believes the move could also leave much of the protected areas open to fishing from foreign fishers who are already banned from U.S. waters. Fewer U.S. fishermen in the area, means fewer eyes on the water. "They can let the government know they have seen boats making encroachments and if you take those away what's to stop foreigners from fishing," said Dalzelle. The concern is for the areas around the nation of Kiribas, which permits European fishers to troll in their waters. "I suspect there will be a great temptation to just pop into our area, because they know they will be no fishing vessels be there to see them if they do that," said Dalzelle. The proposal could go into effect as soon as this year after a comment period, which has the U.S. fishers worried. Dalzell said the move shows the political vulnerability of the region, with only the Hawaii congressional delegation and two non-voting delegates to congress representing Guam and Samoa.

## **2NC Economy I/L**

### **Fishing industry key to the global economy**

**MSC 8-** Marine Stewardship Council, 2008 ("The Seafood Economy," July 26th, Available online at <http://www.msc.org/healthy-oceans/the-oceans-today/the-seafood-economy>, Accessed 7-5-14)

Millions of people work in the seafood industry, contributing to local, regional and global trade on a massive scale and maintaining livelihoods, earnings and employment. It's not just about fishing. Seafood-related jobs include processing, packing, transport, retail and restaurants. Through these diverse businesses, the seafood economy generates financial security for individuals and a valuable source of GDP. The value of the global seafood industry The export value of world trade in fish was US\$63 billion in 2003, and is more than the combined value of net exports of rice, coffee, sugar and tea Source: United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization About 200 million livelihoods depend directly or indirectly on the fishing industry Source: United Nations Environment Program Half of the seafood traded worldwide comes from developing countries Source: United Nations Environment Program Fish exports are a valuable source of foreign exchange for many developing countries. Globally, developing countries are net exporters of fishery products. Source: United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization

### **Money in the fishing industry has a multiplier effect**

**Scott 4-** Loren C. Scott, President of Loren C. Scott & Associates, Inc., an economic consulting firm, previous Department Chair of Economics at LSU, 2004 ("THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF RECREATIONAL SALTWATER FISHING ON THE LOUISIANA ECONOMY," The Coastal Conservation Association of Louisiana, April 2004, Available online at <http://www.lorenscottassociates.com/Reports/ImpactofSaltwaterFishing.pdf>, Accessed 7-5-14)

In Section III we will examine the indirect or multiplier effects of the spending that saltwater anglers pump into the Louisiana economy. To estimate the economic impact of saltwater fishing, think of the State economy as a large economic pond. Into this pond a rock will be dropped labeled "recreational saltwater fishing". This rock alone will make quite a splash, because of all the spending by these anglers, which will be documented in Section II. However, when that rock hits the pond, it sends out ripples to the edge of the pond. This is the so-called "multiplier effect". This occurs because when anglers spend money on, say rods and reels, at a sporting goods store, employees and owners of that store receive additional, new income. They will then spend this new money at restaurants, car dealerships, department stores, grocery stores, etc., creating new incomes at those establishments which will cause another round of new spending, etc., etc. This is the so-called multiplier effect of the angler's spending.

### **Fishing industry key to the economy**

**University of British Columbia 10-** University of British Columbia, 2010 ("Global fisheries research finds promise and peril: While industry contributes \$240B annually, overfishing takes toll on people and revenue," Science Daily, September 14th, Available online at <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2010/09/100914115246.htm>, Accessed 7-5-14)

This research, conducted by the University of British Columbia's Fisheries Centre, with support from the Pew Environment Group, quantifies the social and economic value of fish around the world and also calculates the loss of both revenue and dependable protein sources from years of overfishing. "We know fish play an important ecological role in the marine

environment, but these studies assess their 'out-of-the-water' value to people across the globe," says lead economist Associate Professor Rashid Sumaila at the University of British Columbia's Fisheries Centre. "Whether you are looking at fish as a financial resource or a source of protein, our research shows that the benefits of healthy, robust fisheries have enormous value far beyond the fishing dock." Dr. Sumaila and his team of researchers also found that: Overfishing reduces revenue. Annually, estimated global catch losses from overfishing totaled up to seven to 36 per cent of the actual tonnage landed in a year, resulting in a landed value loss of between US\$6.4-36 billion each year. Fishing has a multiplier effect. The fishing industry's economic impact on related businesses, such as boat building, international transport and bait suppliers, is roughly three times larger than the value of fish at first sale. Fisheries generate incomes. Wild fisheries generate more than US\$63 billion in annual household incomes around the world. Non-industrial uses of the oceans are a net positive for economies and jobs. Recreational use of ocean ecosystems by sport divers, whale watchers and recreational fishermen contributes US\$47 billion each year to national economies worldwide and generates nearly 1.1 million jobs.

## Fishing industry key to the economy- direct value may be smaller but multiplier effect huge

**Dyck and Sumaila 10-** Andrew J. Dyck, Independent researcher of econometrics, behaviour economics, and fisheries; U. Rashid Sumaila, Professor of Ocean & Fisheries Economics, the University of British Columbia, 2010 ("Economic impact of ocean fish populations in the global fishery," Journal of Bioeconomics, August 19th, Available online at [http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/243/art%253A10.1007%252Fs10818-010-9088-3.pdf?auth66=1404756103\\_848b52ee226be74c6296fdec5fa67869&ext=.pdf](http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/243/art%253A10.1007%252Fs10818-010-9088-3.pdf?auth66=1404756103_848b52ee226be74c6296fdec5fa67869&ext=.pdf), Accessed 7-5-14)

However, despite its disposition in relation to other sectors, the fishing industry remains an important one for policy makers; especially in developing and resource rich regions. When fisheries output is combined with other sectors dependent on ocean resources its total impact on the economy can be much greater (Pontecorvo et al. 1980). Furthermore, although the fishing sector's share of national output for many developing nations ranges between 0.5 and 2.5%, the industry may support much greater output through 'trickle-up' linkages in the economy (Bene et al. 2007).

The economic multiplier is used in fisheries research to emphasize that the industry has many linkages throughout the economy. Such multipliers are a factor by which we can multiply the value of final demand for an economic activity's output to obtain its total contribution to economic output including activities directly and indirectly dependent on it. Therefore, the importance of this industry to the economy may be understated when considering only the direct values obtained through the usual method of national accounts. The amount normally cited when considering the total production of the fisheries sector (referred to as 'Landed Value' —Sumaila et al. 2007; Willmann et al. 2009) is the value of fish when they change hands for the first time after leaving the boat. This is the direct economic value of fisheries sector output and is considered as the starting point for total economic impact in input-output analysis.

It is only in rare occasions that the value chain for fish ends immediately after landing such as in the case of subsistence fishing, where fish is usually caught for own consumption. Rather, fish are sold to markets where they are again re-sold to consumers or an intermediary will purchase larger quantities for processing; these products will later make their way to the dinner table. Each time a fish changes hands, it is combined with other goods, be it tin for canning or the management services of someone involved in retail distribution. At each link in this value chain, a portion of the value of output from each sector can be traced back to capture fisheries, with this share decreasing the further down the chain it goes. In this way, we can follow a fish through the chain of production to reveal that a great deal of economic activity is supported by capture fisheries. Such

economic impacts are referred to as the 'downstream effects' of fisheries and can occur in many sectors ranging from agriculture and forestry through to manufacturing and financial services.

## **Fishing industry has a huge economic impact**

**Dyck and Sumaila 10-** Andrew J. Dyck, Independent researcher of econometrics, behaviour economics, and fisheries; U. Rashid Sumaila, Professor of Ocean & Fisheries Economics, the University of British Columbia, 2010 ("Economic impact of ocean fish populations in the global fishery," Journal of Bioeconomics, August 19th, Available online at [http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/243/art%253A10.1007%252Fs10818-010-9088-3.pdf?auth66=1404756103\\_848b52ee226be74c6296fdec5fa67869&ext=.pdf](http://download.springer.com/static/pdf/243/art%253A10.1007%252Fs10818-010-9088-3.pdf?auth66=1404756103_848b52ee226be74c6296fdec5fa67869&ext=.pdf), Accessed 7-5-14)

Input-output analysis is not a new concept in economics and its use traces back to the very beginnings of quantitative economic methods. However, the use of this technique for the marine capture fisheries sector as proposed by this study is the first of its kind. It is apparent from our analysis that when one accounts for the total of direct, indirect and induced economic activity, the full impact of this sector is much greater than the value of catch landed at the port.

We used a global database of economic flows to consider the direct, indirect, and induced effect of changes in demand for the output from marine capture fisheries as well as its effect on household income. The results suggest that although the landed value of global fisheries is large, considering this value as the contribution of marine capture fisheries to world output underestimates the full impact of this sector to the world economy by a factor of about three. Considering direct, indirect and induced effects in the fisheries sector, we found the total economic impact to be about US\$ 240 billion per year. Furthermore, the capture fisheries sector is estimated to produce more than US\$ 63 billion per annum in household income when direct, indirect and induced effects are considered.

## **Fishing is a critical industry for the US economy** **Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, 3**

["MARINE PROTECTED AREAS — A Threat to Recreational Fishing?", [http://advocacy.shimano.com/publish/content/advocacy/en/us/index/government\\_affairs/marine\\_protected\\_areas.download.-Par30parsys-0002-downloadFile.html/A%20Threat%20to%20Recreational%20Fishing.pdf](http://advocacy.shimano.com/publish/content/advocacy/en/us/index/government_affairs/marine_protected_areas.download.-Par30parsys-0002-downloadFile.html/A%20Threat%20to%20Recreational%20Fishing.pdf), ML]

The Economic Importance of Recreational Fishing The huge economic impact of recreational fishing in the US is felt in every state. America's nearly 40 million anglers spend over \$45 billion per year on fishing equipment, transportation, lodging and other expenses associated with their sport – that's ten times the amount of all US commercial seafood landings. With a total annual economic impact of \$125 billion, recreational fishing supports over one million jobs and generates \$34 billion in wages and \$16 billion in tax revenues each year. The American model of fisheries (and wildlife) management is funded through fishing license sales and excise taxes on fishing equipment and motorboat fuel. Nearly \$900-million of anglers' and boaters' dollars are provided to the states each year for local conservation and recreation. This important system must be protected to ensure the funding for fisheries conservation is maintained. Its very success depends on angler participation and interest - the opportunity to go fishing. Closing

areas to recreational fishing hurts both the local and national economies and cripples fisheries management.

### **Fishing industry key to the global economy and health**

**The Guardian 10-** The Guardian, 2010 ("Saving global fish stocks would cost 20 million jobs, says UN," Ed Pilkington, May 17th, Available online at <http://www.theguardian.com/environment/2010/may/17/saving-fish-stocks-cost-jobs>, Accessed 7-5-14)

At stake is not just the biodiversity of the oceans, but a substantial chunk of the global economy and the livelihoods that depend on it. The UN estimates there are about 35 million people directly employed in fishing, which translates to about 120 million including their households and 500 million – or about 8% of global population – taking into account indirect businesses such as packaging, freezing and transport. It is also a huge health issue, as fish provides the main source of animal protein for 1 billion of the world's poorest people.

## **2NC Food Security I/L**

### **Fishing industry vital to food security**

Pauly and Swartz 08 (Wilf Swartz, PhD Candidate at the University of British Columbia, and Daniel Pauly, Professor at the University of British Columbia Fisheries Center, "Who's Eating All the Fish? The Food Security Rationale for Culling Cetaceans," 6/23/08

[http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Protecting\\_ocean\\_life/daniel\\_pauly\\_paper\\_iwc\\_2008\\_pdf\\_doc.pdf](http://www.pewtrusts.org/uploadedFiles/wwwpewtrustsorg/Reports/Protecting_ocean_life/daniel_pauly_paper_iwc_2008_pdf_doc.pdf),

Although countries and dependent territories of the South Pacific have very small populations, ¶ their EEZs represent a huge area of the Pacific Ocean. Not surprisingly, **the issue of fisheries are ¶ of vital food security and economic interest** for the countries in the region, **especially for those ¶ with limited land-based resources**. **In 2000, the EEZs of the South Pacific island states yielded ¶ 426,000 tonnes of fish, over 200,000 tonnes of which were skipjacks destined for non-domestic ¶ consumption**. Our analysis shows that the domestic market accounts for less than 5% of fish ¶ caught in the region. Japan, with its renowned taste for sashimi-grade tuna, consumed 30% of the ¶ catch from the region while EU accounted for 4%. It should be noted, however, that the large ¶ portion of the catch destined for 'other' markets is based on catches by distant water fleets from ¶ Taiwan and South Korea, as well as exports of tuna for canning to regional processing bases, for ¶ example in Thailand, and is most likely destined for markets in Japan, EU and North America ¶ (Figure 5). Indeed, **the region and its surrounding high seas provide about 50 to 70 percent of the ¶ world's tuna for canning**. In terms of volume and value, the fisheries in the South Pacific are dominated by the industrial ¶ tuna fisheries, even if taking account of the fact that small scale fisheries catches are strongly ¶ underestimated in official catch statistics (Zeller et al. 2007a, 2007b). However, the vast majority ¶ of fish caught in the region are by distant water vessels from Asia and the United States, with ¶ countries hosting these fleets receiving only a fraction of the benefits from the fisheries found in ¶ their waters as fishing access fees account for 3 to 4 percent of the landed value (Peterson 2005). ¶ Moreover, there are concerns that the large tuna catches by the distant water fisheries may ¶ adversely impact those of the small-scale fishers (Gillett et al.). Indeed, a recent report indicates ¶ that local fishers (e.g. Solomon Islands) are claiming that it is harder to catch tuna now than it ¶ was in the past, and that they have to go further from shore and fish for longer to get the same ¶ catch, with the commercial tuna fisheries often blamed for this decline in catch (Barclay & ¶ Cartwright 2007). \_The domestic share of catches from its EEZs may be even smaller if illegal catches are to be ¶ included. The region has minimal patrolling and enforcement capabilities (Kiribati for example ¶ has only one small patrol boat to monitor its vast EEZ covering an area of over 3.4 million km<sup>2</sup> ¶ ). Thus, illegal fishing, including illegal activities by distant water vessels, is believed to be ¶ widespread in the region (Greenpeace 2007). \_The region has also seen the development of export-oriented fisheries exploiting the coastal ¶ resources such as sea cucumber, lobsters and (live) reef fishes fuelled by the demand to markets ¶ in large Asian cities, notably Hong Kong (Ref. 'WHILE STOCKS LAST'). The local impact of ¶ these fisheries is substantial, as they are usually characterized by intense exploitation that rapid ¶ reduce the abundance of the targeted species. There have been numerous problems with the use ¶ of cyanide and the unsustainable targeting of spawning aggregation. Indeed, these fisheries often ¶ jeopardize the long-term commercial viability of the other fisheries, and food security of coastal communities.